VAPOR INRUSION DATA VALIDATION

Sauget Area 2 Sauget, Illinois

Prepared for U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5 77W. Jackson Blvd. (SR-6J) Chicago, IL 60604-3590

September 4, 2008

URS Corporation 1001 Highlands Plaza Drive West, Suite 300 St. Louis, MO 63110 (314) 429-0100 **Project #21561683**

Sauget Area 2 Sites Group

September 4, 2008

Ms. Leah Evison U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5 77W. Jackson Blvd. (SR-6J) Chicago, IL 60604-3590

Re: Sauget Area 2 - Sauget, Illinois

Dear Leah:

Attached is our Vapor Intrusion Investigation Data Validation Report for the Sauget Area 2 Sites.

Please call us with any comments or questions on this report.

Sincerely,

Gary D. Uphoff

Co-Project Coordinator

Gary Uphoff. By SD. Smith

Steven D. Smith

Co-Project Coordinator

GDU/SDS

cc: Distribution List Attached

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Leah Evison – 1 Hard Copy, 1 CD U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Superfund Division 77 West Jackson Blvd. (SR-6J) Chicago, IL 60604 312-886-6840

Sandra Bron – 2 Hard Copies, 2 CDs Illinois EPA Bureau of Land, FSRS/NPL Unit 1021 North Grand Avenue East P.O. Box 19276 Springfield, Illinois 62794-9276

Lisa Cundiff – 1 Hard Copies, 1 CDs CH2M HILL 727 North First Street Suite 400 St. Louis, MO 63102 314-421-0313 Sauget Area 2 Sites Group – Electronic

Steve Smith – 1 Hard Copies, 1 CDs Solutia 575 Maryville Centre Drive St. Louis, MO 63141

Sauget Area 2 Sites Group

September 4, 2008

Ms. Leah Evison U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5 77W. Jackson Blvd. (SR-6J) Chicago, IL 60604-3590

Re: Sauget Area 2 - Sauget, Illinois

Dear Leah:

Attached is our Vapor Intrusion Investigation Data Validation Report for the Sauget Area 2 Sites.

Please call us with any comments or questions on this report.

Sincerely,

Gary D. Uphoff

Co-Project Coordinator

Gary Uphoff. By SD. Smith

Steven D. Smith

Co-Project Coordinator

GDU/SDS

cc: Distribution List Attached

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Leah Evison – 1 Hard Copy, 1 CD U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Superfund Division 77 West Jackson Blvd. (SR-6J) Chicago, IL 60604 312-886-6840

Sandra Bron – 2 Hard Copies, 2 CDs Illinois EPA Bureau of Land, FSRS/NPL Unit 1021 North Grand Avenue East P.O. Box 19276 Springfield, Illinois 62794-9276

Lisa Cundiff – 1 Hard Copies, 1 CDs CH2M HILL 727 North First Street Suite 400 St. Louis, MO 63102 314-421-0313 Sauget Area 2 Sites Group – Electronic

Steve Smith – 1 Hard Copies, 1 CDs Solutia 575 Maryville Centre Drive St. Louis, MO 63141

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GLOSSARY (OF ACRO	NYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	G-1			
SECTION 1	INTRODUCTION					
	1.1	Project Description	1-1			
	1.2	Overall Project Objectives				
SECTION 2	FIELD A	FIELD ACTIVITIES				
	2.1	Quality Control Activities	2-1			
	2.1	2.1.1 Document Review				
		2.1.2 Equipment Decontamination				
		2.1.3 Sample Verification				
		2.1.4 Field Equipment Calibration				
	2.2	Sample Collection Activities	2-2			
		2.2.1 Sample Containers, Handling, and Labeling				
		2.2.2 Documentation of Field Activities				
		2.2.3 Sample Designation				
		2.2.4 Field QA/QC Samples				
SECTION 3	CHAIN OF CUSTODIES					
SEOTION 5	3.1	Sample Documentation				
CECTION 4		ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES				
SECTION 4						
	4.1	Laboratory Procedures				
		4.1.1 Volatile Organics				
		4.1.2 Oxygen				
	4.2	Laboratory QA/QC Samples				
		4.2.1 Method Blank				
		4.2.2 Surrogate Spikes				
		4.2.3 Laboratory Control Samples				
		4.2.4 Internal Standards Performance	4-2			
SECTION 5	DATA F	REVIEW/VALIDATION PROCESS	5-1			
	5.1	Data Review/Validation Elements	5-1			
		5.1.1 Completeness of Data Package	5-2			
		5.1.2 Sample Preservation and Holding Times	5-3			
		5.1.3 Blanks				
		5.1.4 Surrogates	5-3			
		5.1.5 Laboratory Control Samples	5-4			
		5.1.6 Field Duplicate Samples	5-4			
		5.1.7 Instrument Performance Check (Data Validation Only).	5-5			
		5.1.8 Run Log Review (Data Validation Only)				
		5.1.9 Chromatogram Review (Data Validation Only)				
		5.1.10 Initial Calibration (Data Validation Only)				
		5.1.11 Calibration Verification (Data Validation Only)	5-5			



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	5.2	Measurement of Quality Assurance Objectives	5-6
		5.2.1 Precision	
		5.2.2 Accuracy	5-6
		5.2.3 Completeness	
		5.2.4 Representativeness	5-7
		5.2.5 Comparability	5-7
		5.2.6 Sensitivity	
	5.3	Data Assessment	
		5.3.1 Summary of Data Quality Requirements	5-8
		5.3.2 Data Usability Assessment	
SECTION 6	DATA	A REVIEW	6-1
	6.1	Data Quality Review Checklists for All SDGs	6-1
SECTION 7	DATA	A VALIDATION	7-1
	7.1	Introduction	7-1
	7.2	Level IV Validation Of Data	
SECTION 8	DATA	A ASSESSMENT	8-1
	8.1	Overall Data Assessment	8-1
	8.2	Sampling Issues	
	8.3	Data Review/Validation Issues	
	8.4	Appropriateness	8-2
	8.5	Limitations	
SECTION 9	REFE	PENCES	0.1



TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

Table 1-1	Summary of Collected Samples Sauget Area 2
Table 2-1	Summary of Field Duplicate Samples Sauget Area 2
Table 4-1	Data Review/Validation Qualifier Codes
Table 6-1	Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709432
Table 6-2	Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709494
Table 6-3	Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709528
Table 6-4	Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709557
Table 6-5	Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709576
Table 6-6	Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709608
Table 6-7	Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709647
Table 6-8	Summary of Qualifications for SDG 710035
Table 6-9	Summary of Qualifications for SDG 710142
Table 6-10	Summary of Qualifications for SDG 710169
Table 6-11	Summary of Qualifications for SDGs 709432 - 710169

List of Appendices

Appendix A **Analytical Results** Appendix B Copies of COCs

Appendix C Level III Review and Level IV Validation Checklists



GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CV Calibration Verification CLP Contract Laboratory Program

CM Corrective Measures COC Chain of Custody Data Quality Objective DQO

Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry GC/MS

Initial Calibration Verification **ICV**

ID Identification

IEPA Illinois Environmental Protection Agency

Estimated Value J

LCS Laboratory Control Sample Method Detection Limit MDL

MS/MSD Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate

ND Non-detect

%D Percent Difference Percent Recovery %R

Percent Relative Standard Deviation %RSD

Precision, Accuracy, Representativeness, Completeness, Comparability **PARCCS**

and Sensitivity

Quality Assurance/Quality Control QA/QC Quality Assurance Project Plan **QAPP QCSR Quality Control Summary Report**

Correlation coefficient

Rejected value R RF Response Factor RL Reporting Limit

RPD Relative Percent Difference Sauget Area 2 Sites Group SA2SG SDG Sample Delivery Group Selected ion monitoring SIM Standard Operating Procedure SOP Thermal Conductivity Detection TCD Non-detect Value (under the MDL) IJ UJ Estimated Non-detect (under the MDL)

URS URS Corporation

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers **USACE**

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency USEPA

VOCs Volatile Organic Compound

Work Plan WP



SECTIONONE Introduction

The purpose of this investigation was to collect air samples to evaluate the soil gas vapor intrusion pathway as part of a Supplemental Investigation conducted at the Sauget Area 2 Sites in Illinois. This Validation Report discusses the laboratory analyses of air samples performed by Air Toxics LTD, of Folsom California. The field investigation was conducted by URS Corporation (URS). Field quality control activities such as sample verification that could have affected the data are also addressed. The data usability is assessed in this Report in support of additional data characterization for the site.

1.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The existing soil data within the Sauget Area 2 Sites appears to be inadequate to use for a vapor intrusion evaluation. Based upon an evaluation of the potential alternatives to evaluate the vapor intrusion pathway, URS conducted a soil gas investigation in the vicinity of buildings near or within the boundaries of the Sauget Area 2 Sites. This investigation provided soil gas concentrations that were be used in the evaluation of vapor intrusion into buildings as part of the Human Health Risk Assessment for the Sauget Area 2 Sites. The investigation followed the procedures detailed in the Sauget Area 1 Soil Vapor Intrusion Investigation Work Plan, dated February 28, 2007. The samples collected as part of this investigation is listed in Table 1-1 of this report.

1.2 OVERALL PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The objective of the sampling was to provide soil gas concentrations that were used in the evaluation of vapor intrusion into buildings as part of the Human Health Risk Assessment for the Sauget Area 2 Sites.



SECTIONTWO Field Activities

2.1 QUALITY CONTROL ACTIVITIES

Document review activities took place prior to and concurrent with the field program implementation. Communication with the project manager clarified and confirmed the proposed sampling activities when conflicting information was encountered in the work plan document. The review and continuous communication assured that the samples collected during this program would meet prescribed project guidelines and satisfy the project data quality objectives (DQOs). Documentation of sampling activities and sample shipment chain-of-custody (COC) records were designed to confirm that all proposed investigation activities were completed as planned. Copies of the COC forms are presented in Appendix B of this report.

2.1.1 **Document Review**

Prior to the startup of field activities, the Soil Gas Investigation WP, the Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP), and the Health and Safety Plan were provided to the members of the field sampling teams for their review. This familiarized them with the site being investigated, the objectives of the investigation, and the SOPs under which the field activities were to be completed. Field personnel were briefed on the work to be completed prior to project startup. Coordination of the field sampling activities was maintained through open communication among project management personnel, the field sampling teams, and the analytical laboratories.

Equipment Decontamination 2.1.2

The equipment decontamination was completed by the laboratory. The 6 or 1-Liter Summa canisters were batch certified by the laboratory before being sent to the work site. Equipment decontamination was not required by the URS field personnel.

2.1.3 Sample Verification

During field activities, the field sampling team reviewed the QAPP to verify the sample collection requirements for each sampling location. The review included the verification of target analytes, sample container requirements and the quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) sampling requirements. Information concerning the number and type of samples collected at each location was documented as identified in Section 2.2.2. Any questions or inconsistencies that arose during the field activities were directed to the URS Project Manager for resolution.

2.1.4 Field Equipment Calibration

Field equipment did not require calibration.



SECTIONTWO Field Activities

2.2 SAMPLE COLLECTION ACTIVITIES

Samples were collected for chemical analyses during the investigation in accordance with the field sampling procedures summarized in the Soil Gas Investigation WP. The samples were collected at the Sauget Area 2 Sites from September to October 2007. Table 1-1 of this Quality Summary Control Report (QSCR) summarizes the samples collected and includes sample identification, sampling date and time, sample matrix, and parameters analyzed for each sample.

Samples were submitted to Air Toxics, LTD in Folsom, California for all parameters.

2.2.1 Sample Containers, Handling, and Labeling

The samples were collected in certified pre-cleaned Summa canisters, sealed, and affixed with a canister sample label in accordance with the Sample Handling Procedures listed in SOP No. 25 (Sample Containers, Preservation and Holding Times). Samples were placed the box provided by the laboratory, and sample custody was maintained until shipment to the laboratory. Sample labels included the sample identification number, and the sample collection date and time as specified in Section 5 of the QAPP.

Sample information, such as identification numbers, targeted analytes, sampling times, and QA/QC sample types, was documented on COC forms for shipment to the analytical laboratory. Completed COC forms were signed and one copy of the completed COC form was removed and retained for the field and office files. URS St. Louis put the Summa canisters in the box provided by the laboratory, sealed the box, and shipped them via overnight delivery service to Air Toxics, LTD.

The analytical laboratories and URS were in contact regularly regarding the number and type of samples shipped. These conversations also allowed for the expedient resolution of any questions or discrepancies arising from previous sample shipments.

2.2.2 **Documentation of Field Activities**

Field logbooks were completed for the documentation of the field activities. All field activities and samples collected were documented in the field logbooks. Sample collection was also documented on the COCs.



SECTIONTWO Field Activities

2.2.3 Sample Designation

Samples collected during the Supplemental Investigation were labeled with unique sample identification as summarized in Section 4 of the QAPP. There was no transcription errors associated with the samples collected.

2.2.4 Field QA/QC Samples

QA/QC activities in the field included the collection of field blanks and duplicate sample pairs. The following sections detail the field QA/QC samples collected.

2.2.4.1 Field Duplicate Samples

Field duplicate samples were collected and submitted for analysis at an approximate ten percent frequency. Field duplicates were collected following the same procedures as the original samples. The field duplicates were submitted to Air Toxics, LTD as routine analytical samples.

Field duplicate results provided estimates for overall precision of sample collection, field sample preparation, and laboratory analysis. The duplicate sample data was used to assess the usability of the sample data. Field duplicates are identified in Table 2-1. The results of the field duplicate samples are discussed in the data reviews summarized in Appendix C of this Validation Report.

Field Blanks

Field blanks were collected and submitted to the laboratory with the investigative samples and analyzed for the same parameters as the investigative samples. Field blanks were collected from a certified air source in the field. Field blanks were analyzed to check for procedural contamination at the site which may have caused sample contamination.



3.1 SAMPLE DOCUMENTATION

Documentation of sample tracking is an important aspect of environmental investigations and is designed to maintain the sample integrity subsequent to sample collection.

The URS field crews were responsible for completing COC forms which described the sample identification, time of collection, sample matrix, analyses requested, preservatives (if required), and any additional comments. The COCs were placed in the boxes shipped to the laboratory. Upon receipt of the boxes, the laboratory reviewed each box and accompanying COCs. Copies of the completed COCs are presented in Appendix B.

The laboratory sent URS sample confirmations via e-mail. Some minor discrepancies were noted during the sample receipt. These issues were addressed immediately with the field manager and were corrected prior to the submittal of the data package. URS was contacted regarding an anomaly for samples received September 24, 2007. The "relinquished by" portion of the COC was not signed by URS before samples were shipped to the laboratory. All samples were received by the laboratory in good condition. No additional problems or discrepancies were noted. All issues listed above were resolved prior to analysis and did not impact project DQOs.



4.1 LABORATORY PROCEDURES

The samples collected during the Supplemental Investigation were analyzed following USEPA methods as summarized below. The associated QC review and data validation summaries are provided in Appendix C, respectively. The laboratory provided, in various batches, documentation for the methods listed below, including sample preparation, sample tracking, and documentation controls.

The data reported by the laboratory were reviewed and qualified accordingly. The qualifiers assigned are listed in Table 4-1.

4.1.1 Volatile Organics

VOC soil gas analysis was prepared and analyzed by USEPA Methods TO-15 and TO-15 selected ion monitoring (SIM). Method TO-15 utilizes gas chromatography/mass spectrometry (GC/MS) for separation and detection, respectively.

4.1.2 Oxygen

Modified ASTM Method D1946 is a gas chromatography/thermal conductivity detection (GC/TCD) method that was used for determining the chemical composition of reformed gases and gaseous mixtures. Samples were prepared and analyzed by following Modified ASTM Method D1946.

4.2 LABORATORY QA/QC SAMPLES

4.2.1 Method Blank

The method blank for the analysis consisted of is an unused, certified canister that has not left the laboratory. The blank canister was pressurized with humidified, ultra-pure zero air and carried through the same analytical procedure as the field sample. The blank was carried through each step of the analytical method to analysis. The method blank data were used to evaluate potential contamination contributed to sample preparation and analysis during normal laboratory operations.

Surrogate Spikes 4.2.2

Surrogate spikes are compounds added to every blank, sample, laboratory control sample, and standard when specified in the analytical methodology. The results are utilized to evaluate the accuracy of analytical measurements on a sample-specific basis. Surrogates are generally brominated, fluorinated, or isotopically labeled compounds not expected to be present in



environmental media. Results are expressed as percent recovery (%R) of the surrogate spike. Recoveries outside of criteria can indicate evidence of matrix interference or problems with internal standards.

4.2.3 **Laboratory Control Samples**

Laboratory control samples (LCS) are well-characterized, laboratory-generated samples and are used to monitor the laboratory's day-to-day performance of analytical methods. The organics LCS limits are based on ± three sigma and are updated every six months. LCSs are used to monitor the precision and accuracy of the analytical process independent of matrix effects. In some instances, the LCS is used to identify any background interference or contamination of the analytical system, which may lead to the reporting of elevated concentration levels or false positive results. The results of the LCS are compared to well-defined evaluation criteria to determine whether the laboratory system is "in control." Controlling laboratory operations with LCS, rather than surrogates or matrix spike/matrix spike duplicate (MS/MSD), offers the advantage of being able to differentiate low recoveries due to procedural errors from those due to matrix effects.

5.2.3 Internal Standards Performance

Internal standards, which are compounds not found in environmental samples, are spiked into blanks, samples, and LCSs. The internal standards are spiked into the GC trap at the collection time. Internal standards are used as a reference for calibration and for controlling the precision and bias of the analytical method. Internal standards must meet retention time and performance criteria specified in the analytical method or the sample would have been reanalyzed.



The data review process, which involved a review of the laboratory summary data, was implemented to assess the quality of data resulting from the field sampling program with respect to the quality assurance objectives established for the project. In order to evaluate the appropriate usage of the data, in supporting decisions to be made, the data was evaluated with respect to data quality, major data uses, and the remedial decision to be made. Data that did not meet the criteria were qualified or discussed for the limitation on usability. In addition, approximately 10 percent of the data underwent a more comprehensive evaluation which included the review of raw data (i.e., chromatograms, run logs, etc.), recalculation of data, and sample tracking. For the purpose of this document, this extended review was termed full validation.

The following sections summarize the data review and data validation approach used for the Sauget A2 samples. In general, the review and validation followed guidance as presented in USEPA Contract Laboratory Program (CLP) National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review (USEPA 1999), as applicable to USEPA analytical methods and method-specific criteria. As indicated above, the data review involved reviewing QC summary forms, whereas the validation additionally involved the review of raw data. Table 3.1 of the Sauget A2 QAPP (URS 2004) summarizes the data review/validation criteria in tabular format.

5.1 DATA REVIEW/VALIDATION ELEMENTS

Analytical laboratory results were reviewed following guidance presented in USEPA CLP National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review (USEPA 1999). The data were reviewed/validated using the QC criteria specified in the Sauget A2 QAPP (URS 2004). These guidelines were used as applicable to USEPA methods. Method-specific and established laboratory criteria were used for data assessment. Based on results of the data review/validation processes, sample data may have been qualified as **J** (estimated), **UJ** (estimated non-detect), or **U** (non-detect).

Although the data packages provided were not CLP deliverables, the CLP guidance was followed where applicable to USEPA methodology. The QC elements reviewed in laboratory analytical data packages included the following:

- Completeness of the data package
- Laboratory case narrative and log-in receipt forms
- Compliance with required holding times



- Presence of analytes in method blanks and field blanks
- Results of LCS
- Recoveries of surrogate spikes in samples
- Recoveries of internal standards
- Field duplicate samples
- Laboratory duplicate samples

The data validation included all of the items identified above and additionally included the items below:

- Instrument performance check samples
- Run logs review
- Chromatograms review
- Initial calibration
- Calibration verifications (CV)
- Retention time windows
- Analytical result verification

When a result was above the method detection limit (MDL) and below the reporting limit, the laboratory flagged data J to indicate that the concentration reported is an estimated value. The data, including all post-analysis qualifiers, are presented in the data summary tables in Appendix A. The data review and validation results are presented in Appendix C.

The data review and validation procedures used to evaluate the Sauget A2 data are described in this section. The QC review details quality control issues associated with the analysis of the samples, describes if the data required qualification.

5.1.1 Completeness of Data Package

Data packages were reviewed to make certain that they contained the data contractually required in the deliverable. This included checking the data package for the results of each analyte requested on each field sample submitted in the analytical batch, along with the requested QC documentation for the respective methods.



Sample Preservation and Holding Times 5.2.4

Sample holding times were calculated by subtracting the date of sampling, as determined from the COC forms, from the date of sample analysis. If the sample analysis was completed outside of the required holding times, data was qualified as estimated J (detects) or UJ (nondetects), or rejected **R**, depending on the severity of the exceeded holding time. The validation additionally included reviewing run logs and chromatograms to ensure the dates presented on the summary forms were accurate.

5.1.3 Blanks

Guidance provided in the USEPA CLP National Functional Guidelines for Organic Review was used for the evaluation of method blanks and field blanks. If analytes were detected in a blank sample, but not in samples associated with the blank sample, then data was not qualified. If analytes were reported in a blank and in associated samples, the following actions were taken:

- Positive sample results were reported without qualification when the concentration of the analyte in the sample exceeded 10 times (10x) the amount in a blank for common laboratory contaminants (methylene chloride, acetone, 2-butanone), or exceeded 5 times (5x) the amount in a blank for other compounds. Note: The 10x rule was only applied to method blank samples.
- When the sample results were greater than the reporting limit (RL), but less than the required multiple (5x or 10x) of the method blank result, sample results were qualified as non-detect **U**, and the RL was raised to the sample concentration.
- When the sample results were less than the RLs and less than the required multiple of the method blank result, sample results were qualified as non-detect U at the RL.

During the data validation, the chromatograms were reviewed to ensure all peaks were identified and explained. In addition, run logs were reviewed to ensure a method or preparation blank was analyzed with each batch.

5.1.4 Surrogates

Surrogates were used to assess accuracy for TO-15 and TO-15 SIM, analyses on a sample specific basis. Criteria for recovery of surrogate compounds spiked into samples are provided in Table 3.3 of the QAPP (URS 2004). For TO-15 and TO-15 SIM analyses, if any surrogate was out of specification due to recoveries greater than the upper evaluation limit, indicating a high bias, positive results for that sample were qualified as estimated **J**, and non-detect data were not qualified. If recoveries were below the lower evaluation limit, indicating a low bias, but greater



than 10 percent, positive results for that sample were qualified as estimated **J**, and non-detect results were qualified as estimated UJ. For any surrogate recovery below 10 percent, positive results for that sample were qualified as estimated **J**, and non-detect results were qualified as rejected **R**.

The validation additionally included recalculating the surrogate values from the raw data and reviewing the chromatograms to ensure the surrogate compounds were within the established retention time windows.

5.1.5 **Laboratory Control Samples**

LCS is well characterized, laboratory-generated samples used to monitor the laboratory's day-today performance for organic analyses, and to assess the accuracy and precision of the analytical process independent of matrix effects. Evaluation criteria for LCS are provided in Appendix A of the QAPP (URS 2004). Sample results associated with a LCS recovery below the evaluation limit were qualified as estimated **J** (detects) or **UJ** (nondetects) based on a potential low bias. If LCS recoveries were less than half the lower evaluation limit, sample results reported as nondetect were qualified rejected **R**. Detected sample results associated with a LCS recovery above the evaluation limit were qualified as estimated J based on a potential high bias. Data reported as non-detect were not qualified based on a LCS with potential high bias.

The validation additionally included reviewing extraction and run logs to ensure a LCS was analyzed with each batch. Approximately 10 percent of the LCS recoveries were recalculated using the raw data. In addition, chromatograms were reviewed to ensure the LCS compounds were within the retention time windows.

5.1.6 Field Duplicate Samples

Field duplicate samples were collected at a frequency of approximately 10 percent, as required by the Sauget A2 QAPP (URS 2004). Relative percent differences (RPDs) were calculated for each field duplicate pair. Precision evaluation criteria of 25 percent RPD for soil gas samples were considered if the analyte concentrations were greater than 5x the RL for both samples. For analytical results less than 5x the RL, for either or both samples, RPD evaluation criteria of $\pm 2x$ the RL were utilized. Duplicate results were evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine if qualification of data was necessary. Where it was determined that qualification of field duplicate samples was required, associated data were qualified **J** (detects) or **UJ** (nondetects).



Instrument Performance Check (Data Validation Only) 5.1.7

The laboratory was required to analyze an instrument performance check sample every 12 hours of sample analysis. The instrument performance check sample summaries were compared to the method criteria. In addition, approximately 20 percent of the values were recalculated from the raw data. The laboratory was required to meet the method criteria prior to analyzing samples. If the laboratory did not meet the tuning criteria, the associated samples were qualified as **R**.

5.1.8 Run Log Review (Data Validation Only)

Review of the run logs involved reviewing the logs to determine that samples were analyzed as presented on the sample summary forms. The sample run logs were reviewed to determine that the correct sample volume was prepared, the appropriate QC samples (e.g., LCS...) were analyzed as part of the analytical batch, and the samples were analyzed in the method-required order.

5.1.9 Chromatogram Review (Data Validation Only)

This involved a review of each chromatogram to determine that peaks were within the acceptable retention time windows of the associated standard. The review also included comparing the analysis times presented on the instrument run logs to those presented on the sample chromatograms. In addition, the review identified all peaks present on the chromatogram as either: target analytes, internal standards, surrogates, or tentatively identified compounds.

5.1.10 Initial Calibration (Data Validation Only)

Each method required establishing an initial calibration curve. The data validation involved reviewing the percent relative standard deviations (%RSDs), the response factors (RFs) or the correlation coefficient ® if linear regression was employed. If %RSDs, RFs, or correlation coefficient ® were not met for an analyte, the associated data was qualified as J, UJ, or R, depending on the severity of the outlying data point. One analyte per internal standard was recalculated using the raw data.

5.1.11 Calibration Verification (Data Validation Only)

Each method required the analysis of CV samples to ensure the initial calibration was still valid. The data validation involved reviewing the percent difference (%D) of the RFs between the CV and the associated calibration curve. If the RF or %D criteria were not met for an analyte, the associated data was qualified as J, UJ, or R, depending on the severity of the outlying data. One



analyte per internal standard, or 10 percent of the data presented on the continuing calibration summary forms, were recalculated using the raw data.

5.2 MEASUREMENT OF QUALITY ASSURANCE OBJECTIVES

The measurement of quality assurance was determined by the assessment of precision, accuracy, representativeness, completeness, comparability, and sensitivity (PARCCS). The PARCCS definitions are included below and the PARCCS assessments are included in Section 8.

5.2.1 Precision

Precision is the measure of variability between individual sample measurements under prescribed conditions. Replicate measurements of known standards and the analysis of duplicate environmental samples assess precision. Evaluating the RPDs obtained from results of laboratory duplicate, and field duplicate samples assessed precision. The precision of the data is discussed in Section 8.

5.2.5 Accuracy

Accuracy is the degree of agreement between the measurement of a known sample and an accepted reference or true value. Evaluating %Rs for LCS samples, and surrogates assessed accuracy. The accuracy of the data is discussed in Section 8.

5.2.6 Completeness

Following the QC review and validation of the data packages for the site, the data were assessed with respect to the fulfillment of QA objectives and usability. The completeness for laboratory analytical data for the site was calculated by the ratio of acceptable (including estimated data) analyses requested on the samples submitted for analysis, to the total number of analytical results requested.

$$\% Complete = \frac{Number\ of\ Valid\ Analytical\ Results (including\ estimated\ J\ results)}{Total\ Number\ of\ Analytical\ Results\ Requested}$$

The percent completeness, with respect to overall project objectives for the Sauget A2 project, was evaluated for the data required in making decisions on a case-by-case basis. In general, samples critical to the decision process required a 95 percent completeness goal.



5.2.4 Representativeness

Representativeness is the degree to which data accurately and precisely represents a characteristic of a population, parameter variations at a sampling point, or an environmental condition. Representativeness is a parameter primarily concerned with the proper design of the sampling program (such as sampling location strategy) or sub-sampling of a given sample. Assessment of representativeness includes an evaluation of precision. Therefore, reviewing the precision of field duplicate samples collected from a site can assess representativeness of the analytical results, with respect to the medium sampled. Review criteria for field duplicate analyses are identified in Section 5.1.7.

5.2.5 Comparability

Comparability expresses qualitatively the confidence with which one data set can be compared to another. Data are comparable when collection techniques, measurement procedures, methods, and reporting are equivalent for all samples within the sample set. Section 8 contains a qualitative assessment of data comparability.

5.3.1 Sensitivity

Sensitivity broadly describes the RL established to meet the project-specific DQOs. The sample RL is the lowest concentration of an analyte present in a sample that can be quantified with a specified level of confidence. The RLs are a function of the sample characteristics, MDLs, and laboratory performance.

MDLs are determined by the laboratory and defined as the level at which the laboratory can reliably quantify the concentration of an analyte on multiple analyses. The RLs are greater than the MDLs because MDL studies are performed using laboratory-prepared samples (spiked zero air); whereas, environmental samples are naturally more variable. United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) requires that RLs are 3-5 times the MDL. MDLs and RLs are provided in Tables 1.4B through 1.4D of the Sauget A2 QAPP (URS 2004). For this project, data are reported below the RLs as estimated J. Factors that may result in elevated RLs are discussed below.

 High concentrations of target or non-target analytes may require that the sample extract be diluted to avoid saturation of the detector, or to quantify the analyte concentration within the calibration range of the instrument. Consequently, RLs are elevated in proportion to the dilution factor.



- Matrix interference may require that the sample be diluted to reduce or eliminate the interference. Consequently, the RLs are elevated in proportion to the dilution factor.
- The physical characteristics of the matrix do not permit concentration to the required final volume during sample preparation, resulting in a larger sample extract volume and, consequently, an elevation in RLs.
- Matrix interference may require the RLs be elevated because of the inability to quantify data below the elevated RL.

In a given sample, one or more of these effects may be exhibited. When the RLs have been elevated as a result of one or more of the above causes, surrogate or target compounds present at low concentrations may not be detected. Therefore, elevated RLs may cause limitations to the application of the data for its intended use. These limitations on data for contaminants of concern are discussed on a case-by-case basis.

5.3.2 DATA ASSESSMENT

The assessment of data involves the consideration of data uses, the identification of data which were qualified or otherwise deviated from the Sauget A2 QAPP requirements, and the limitations associated with the evaluation of data in supporting decisions to be made.

5.3.3 Summary of Data Quality Requirements

Data collected in the corrective measures (CM) must be of known quality to support the uses for which it is intended. Data must meet the minimum quality standards to be useful in assessing the chemicals of concern, if any were released from the site, the acceptable level of uncertainty, and the concentrations in environmental media of concern at potential exposure points. Additionally, RLs must meet the levels necessary to determine whether analytes are present at concentrations of concern (i.e., above relative background concentrations, regulatory standards, or risk-based concentrations).

Inherent in providing defensible data is the need for a QA/QC program. The QA/QC program must have measurement tools so that data collected will be of known quality and legally defensible. QA/QC objectives for sampling and analysis were developed for this project which the following as indicators: precision, accuracy, completeness, comparability, representativeness, and sensitivity.



5.3.4 Data Usability Assessment

A determination of data usability was made with respect to project DQOs. Sampling issues and data review/validation issues were discussed in terms of appropriateness of using the data as intended, as well as making recommendations or limitations on data usage. These discussions address items such as elevated RLs, analytes suspected as laboratory contaminants, potential bias in results, and professional judgment utilized in the data review/validation. The data assessment summary is provided in Section 8 of this QCSR.



SECTIONSIX Data Reviews

The A2 sampling activities from September, 2007 to October, 2007 resulted in the collection of 32 soil gas samples, 3 field duplicate samples and 4 field blank samples. The sample results were submitted in multiple SDGs and are noted 709432 through 710169. The samples were identified for the following parameters VOCs by TO-15, TO-15 SIM and Oxygen. All samples were sent to Air Toxics, LTD in Folsom, CA.

Appendix C contains the data quality reviews for all samples. The data quality reviews have been organized by sample delivery group (SDG).

6.1 DATA QUALITY REVIEW CHECKLISTS FOR ALL SDGS

SDGs were reviewed for each parameter separately. Appendix C contains the detailed review checklists for each parameter. In addition, a list of qualifiers for each SDG is provided at the end of the subsequent checklists for that SDG.



7.1 INTRODUCTION

Appendix C summarizes the full validation reports for ten percent of the chemical data for samples collected during the 2007 Sauget A2 field effort. The validation was completed in accordance with USEPA CLP National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review (USEPA 1999), where applicable to USEPA Methods. Additionally, QA/QC criteria established in the QAPP (URS 2004) was used.

LEVEL IV VALIDATION OF DATA 7.2

SDGs were validated at a rate of ten percent for each parameter. Appendix C contains the detailed validation checklists from each parameter.



8.1 OVERALL DATA ASSESSMENT

Quality issues for the data were assessed to evaluate their affect on the major data uses. In general, the objective of the sampling event was to gather data sufficient to evaluate data usability in support of the Supplemental Investigation.

Based on the criteria outlined, all data have met the DQOs and should be accepted for their intended use.

Overall accuracy and precision, assessed by the analysis of LCS and surrogate compounds, was approximately 99.5 percent. Representativeness, assessed by the analysis of field blank samples and field duplicate samples was also acceptable. One hundred percent of the field duplicate results were within criteria. Completeness, defined as the percentage of usable data (data not qualified as R), was approximately 100 percent. Comparability was acceptable as samples were analyzed using the standard operating procedures throughout the project duration. Therefore, the overall PARCC parameters were acceptable. Sensitivity, and its impact on data usability, is included in the report.

8.2 SAMPLING ISSUES

No sampling issues impacted data quality. Section 3 summarizes issues and documents that impact to the project DOO's.

8.3 DATA REVIEW/VALIDATION ISSUES

For laboratory analytical data, QA objectives were specified in the Sauget A2 QAPP (URS 2004). The QA objectives were used as indicators of the quality of data necessary to support identification and quantification of potential chemicals of concern. The data was reviewed and validated as identified in the QAPP (URS 2004). While the data review assessed the data based on the QC summary forms, the data validation was completed to determine if a more extensive review of the data indicated noncompliance with the method SOPs.

As presented in Appendix C, analytical results for some samples were qualified as UJ or J to indicate the quality control associated with that data did not meet evaluation criteria; however, they could be used for decision-making purposes. Analytical results were also qualified as U due to field blank contamination. Appendix C summarizes all qualifications based on Data Quality Reviews and all qualifications based on Data Quality Validations.



8.4 **APPROPRIATENESS**

Analytical methodologies identified in Section 4 were utilized to help determine the presence of any chemicals of concern. With respect to the site description, the analytical methods utilized were appropriate to assess all chemicals of concern.

LIMITATIONS 8.5

Limitations occur when reporting limits have been elevated above the decision point, or data were detected below reporting limits (resulting in estimated data). The summary of analytical data presented in Appendix A identifies the reporting limits for each sample analysis, and the qualifications associated with the data. No limitations were identified. Table 6-11 summarizes all qualifications to the data based on the data review and validation procedures.



SECTIONNINE References

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2005. Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste Physical/Chemical Methods. SW846. Third Edition. Final Update IIIB.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1999. National Functional Guidelines for Organic Data Review. USEPA Contract Laboratory Program. EPA 540/R-9/008. October.











Summary of Qualifications for SDG 710169

TABLE 6-11

SDG	Sample ID	Analysis	Analyte	URS Qual	Code	New RL
709432	VI-2-D	TO-15	4-Ethyltoluene	U	X	-
709432	VI-2-B	TO-15	2-Butanone	U	X	-
709432	VI-2-B	TO-15	Benzene	U	X	-
709494	VI-4-A	TO-15	Freon 12	UJ	L	-
709494	VI-4-B	TO-15	Freon 12	UJ	L	-
709494	VI-3-A	TO-15	Freon 12	J	L	-
709528	VI-3-B	TO-15	Freon 12	J	L	-
709528	VI-3-C	TO-15	Freon 12	UJ	L	-
709528	VI-4-C	TO-15	Freon 12	J	L	-
709528	VI-4-C DUP	TO-15	Freon 12	J	L	-
709528	VI-4-D	TO-15	Freon 12	UJ	L	-
709528	VI-4-E	TO-15	Freon 12	UJ	L	-
709557	VI-5-A	TO-15	m,p -Xylene	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-A	TO-15	4-Ethyltoluene	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-B	TO-15	2-Butanone	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	2-Butanone	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	m,p -Xylene	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	o-Xylene	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	4-Ethyltoluene	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Freon 114	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Chloroethane	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Ethanol	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Acetone	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Hexane	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	1,1-Dichloroethane	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Cyclohexane	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Heptane	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Toluene	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Tetrachloroethane	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15 SIM	Trichloroethene	J	S	-
709576	VI-12-A	TO-15	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	J	С	-
709576	VI-10-A	TO-15	alpha-Chlorotoluene	UJ	С	-
709576	VI-10-A	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether	UJ	С	-
709576	VI-6-A	TO-15	alpha-Chlorotoluene	UJ	С	-
709576	VI-6-A	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether	UJ	С	-
709576	VI-12-A	TO-15	Ethanol	UJ	С	-
709576	VI-12-A	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether	UJ	С	-
709576	VI-10-A	TO-15	2-Butanone	J	С	-
709576	VI-6-A	TO-15	2-Butanone	UJ	С	-
709647	VI-11-A	TO-15	Acetone	U	X	-
709647	VI-11-A	TO-15	2-Butanone	U	X	-
709647	VI-11-A	TO-15	m,p -Xylene	U	X	-
709647	VI-13-A	TO-15	2-Butanone	U	X	-
709647	VI-13-A	TO-15	Benzene	U	X	-
709647	VI-13-A	TO-15	m,p-Xylene	U	X	-

Notes:

Dashed lines indicate a new RL was not required

 $C = Initial \ or \ continuing \ calibration \ \%D \ or \ \%RSD \ outside \ evaluation \ criteria$

- J = Estimated
- L = Low LCS Recovery
- $S = High \; Surrogate \; Recovery$
- SIM = Selected Ion Monitoring
- U = Non-detect
- UJ = Estimated non-detect
- X = Field Blank Contamination

TABLE 6-10

Summary of Qualifications for SDG 710169

SDG	Sample ID	Analysis	Analyte	URS Qual	Code	New RL
710169	No Qualifications					

TABLE 6-9

$Summary\ of\ Qualifications\ for\ SDG\ 710142$

SDG	Sample ID	Analysis	Analyte	URS Qual	Code	New RL
710142	No Qualifications					

TABLE 6-8

$Summary\ of\ Qualifications\ for\ SDG\ 710035$

SDG	Sample ID	Analysis	Analyte	URS Qual	Code	New RL
710035	No Qualifications					

TABLE 6-7
Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709647

						·
SDG	Sample ID	Analysis	Analyte	URS Qual.	Code	New RL
709647	VI-11-A	TO-15	Acetone	U	X	-
709647	VI-11-A	TO-15	2-Butanone	U	X	-
709647	VI-11-A	TO-15	m,p -Xylene	U	X	-
709647	VI-13-A	TO-15	2-Butanone	U	X	-
709647	VI-13-A	TO-15	Benzene	U	X	-
709647	VI-13-A	TO-15	m.p -Xvlene	II	X	_

Notes:

Dashed lines indicate a new RL was not required

U = Non-detect

X = Field Blank Contamination

TABLE 6-6

$Summary \ of \ Qualifications \ for \ SDG \ 709608$

SDG	Sample ID	Analysis	Analyte	URS Qual.	Code	New RL
709608	No Qualifications					

TABLE 6-5

Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709576

SDG	Sample ID	Analysis	Analyte	URS Qual.	Code	New RL
709576	VI-12-A	TO-15	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	J	С	-
709576	VI-10-A	TO-15	alpha-Chlorotoluene	UJ	C	-
709576	VI-10-A	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether UJ C		C	-
709576	VI-6-A	TO-15	alpha-Chlorotoluene	UJ	C	-
709576	VI-6-A	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether	UJ	C	-
709576	VI-12-A	TO-15	Ethanol	UJ	C	-
709576	VI-12-A	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether	UJ	C	-
709576	VI-10-A	TO-15	2-Butanone	J	C	-
709576	VI-6-A	TO-15	2-Butanone	UJ	С	-

Notes:

Dashed lines indicate a new RL was not required

C = Initial or continuing calibration %D or %RSD outside evaluation criteria

J = Estimated

 $UJ = Estimated \ non-detect$

TABLE 6-4
Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709557

SDG	Sample ID	Analysis	Analyte	URS Qual.	Code	New RL
709557	VI-5-A	TO-15	<i>m,p</i> -Xylene	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-A	TO-15	4-Ethyltoluene	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-B	TO-15	2-Butanone	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	2-Butanone	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	<i>m,p</i> -Xylene	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	o-Xylene	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	4-Ethyltoluene	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	U	X	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Freon 114	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Chloroethane	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Ethanol	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Acetone	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Hexane	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	1,1-Dichloroethane	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Cyclohexane	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Heptane	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Toluene	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15	Tetrachloroethane	J	S	-
709557	VI-5-C	TO-15 SIM	Trichloroethene	J	S	-

Notes:

Dashed lines indicate a new RL was not required

- J = Estimated
- S = High Surrogate Recovery
- U = Non-detect
- X = Field Blank Contamination

TABLE 6-3

Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709528

SDG	Sample ID	Analysis	Analyte URS Qual.		Code	New RL
709528	VI-3-B	TO-15	Freon 12	J	L	-
709528	VI-3-C	TO-15	Freon 12	UJ	L	-
709528	VI-4-C	TO-15	Freon 12	J	L	-
709528	VI-4-C DUP	TO-15	Freon 12	J	L	-
709528	VI-4-D	TO-15	Freon 12	UJ	L	-
709528	VI-4-E	TO-15	Freon 12	UJ	L	-

Notes:

Dashed lines indicate a new RL was not required

J = Estimated

L = Low LCS Recovery

 $UJ = Estimated \ non-detect$

TABLE 6-2

Summary of Qualifications for SDG 709494

SDG	Sample ID	Analysis	Analyte	URS Qual.	Code	New RL
709494	VI-4-A	TO-15	Freon 12	UJ	L	-
709494	VI-4-B	TO-15	Freon 12	UJ	L	-
709494	VI-3-A	TO-15	Freon 12	J	L	-

Notes:

Dashed lines indicate a new RL was not required

J = Estimated

L = Low LCS Recovery

UJ = Estimated non-detect

TABLE 6-1

$Summary\ of\ Qualifications\ for\ SDG\ 709432$

SDG	Sample ID	Analysis	Analyte	URS Qual.	Code	New RL
709432	VI-2-D	TO-15	4-Ethyltoluene	U	X	-
709432	VI-2-B	TO-15	2-Butanone	U	X	-
709432	VI-2-B	TO-15	Benzene	U	X	-

Notes:

Dashed lines indicate a new RL was not required

U = Non-detect

 $X = Field \; Blank \; Contamination$

TABLE 4-1

Data Review/Validation Qualifier Codes

	GC/MS Organics		GC and HPLC Organics		Inorganics and Conventionals
Code	Interpretation	Code	Interpretation	Code	Interpretation
a	Incorrect or incomplete analytical sequence	a	Incorrect or incomplete analytical sequence	a	Incorrect or incomplete analytical sequence
c	Calibration failure; poor (RRF) or unstable (%D) response	b	Instrument performance failure or poor chromatography	c	Calibration failure
d	MS/MSD or LCS/LCSD RPD imprecision	c	Calibration failure; poor or unstable (%D) response	d	MSIMSD or LCSILCSD RPD imprecision
e	Sample preservation or cooler temperature failure	d	MS/MSD or LCS/LCSD RPD imprecision	e	Sample preservatmon or cooler temperature failure
f	Field duplicate imprecision	e	Sample preservation or cooler temperature failure	f	Field duplicate imprecision
h	Holding time violation	f	Field duplicate imprecision	h	Holding time violation
j	Tuning Failure or poor mass spectrometer performance	g	Dual column confirmation imprecision	k	Laboratory duplicate imprecision
1	LCS recovery failure	h	Holding time violation	1	LCS recovery failure
m	MS/MSD recovery failure	1	LCS recovery failure	m	MS/MSD recovery failure
n	Internal standard failure	m	MS/MSD recovery failure	n	ICP interference check sample failure
р	Air bubble (> 6 mm or ¼ inch) in VOC vials	р	Air bubble (>6 mm or 1/4 inch) in VOC vials	0	Calibration blank contamination
q	Concentration exceeded the linear range	q	Concentration exceeded the linear range	p	Preparation blank contamination
r	linearity (%RSD or r) failure in initial calibration	r	Linearity (%RSD or r) failure in initial calibration	q	Concentration exceeded the linear range
s	Surrogate failure	s	Surrogate failure	r	Linearity failure in calibration or MSA
t	Tentatively identified Compound	u	No confirmation column	s	Serial dilution failure
w	Identification criteria failure	w	Identification criteria failure	v	Post-digestion spike failure
x	Field and/or equipment blank contamination	x	Field and/or equipment blank contamination	w	CRDL standard recovery failure
y	Trip blank contamination	y	Trip blank contamination	x	Field and/or equipment blank contamination
z	Method blank and/or storage blank contamination	z	Method blank and/or storage blank contamination	z	Laboratory storage blank contamination
Q	Other — see bottom of data report for explanation	Q	Other — see bottom of data report for explanation	Q	Other - see bottom of data report for explanation

The reason code indicates the type of quality control failure that lead to the application of the data validation flag.

TABLE 2-1
Summary of Field Duplicate Samples Sauget Area 2

					(TO-15)	.15 SIM)	(Modified ASTM D-1946)
SDG	Sample ID	Sample Date	Sample Time	Matrix	VOCs (TO	VOC (TO-13	Oxygen (N
SDG 709528	Sample ID VI-4-C	_	_	Matrix Soil gas		× VOC (TO-	Oxygen (N
		Date	Time		VOCs	VOC	Oxygen (Iv
709528	VI-4-C	Date 9/24/07	Time 1210	Soil gas	x AOCs	X	× Oxygen (A
709528 709528	VI-4-C VI-4-C DUP	Date 9/24/07 9/24/07	Time 1210 1210	Soil gas Soil gas	x x x	x x	Oxygen
709528 709528 709647	VI-4-C VI-4-C DUP VI-11-A	9/24/07 9/24/07 9/28/07	Time 1210 1210 939	Soil gas Soil gas Soil gas	x x x	X X X	x Oxygen

TABLE 1-1
Summary of Collected Samples Sauget Area 2

SDG	Sample ID	Sample Date	Sample Time	Matrix	VOCs (TO-15)	VOC (TO-15 SIM)	Oxygen (Modified ASTM D-1946)
709432	VI-2-B	9/19/07	929	Soil gas	X	X	X
709432	VI-091907-FB	9/19/07	1042	Soil gas	X	X	X
709432	VI-2-D	9/19/07	1505	Soil gas	X	X	X
709494	VI-4-A	9/21/07	838	Soil gas	X	X	X
709494	VI-4-B	9/21/07	1007	Soil gas	X	X	X
709494	VI-092107-FB	9/21/07	1022	Soil gas	X	X	X
709494	VI-3-A	9/21/07	1412	Soil gas	X	Х	X
709528	VI-3-B	9/24/07	846	Soil gas	X	Х	
709528	VI-3-C	9/24/07	938	Soil gas	X	Х	
709528	VI-4-C	9/24/07	1210	Soil gas	Х	Х	
709528	VI-4-C DUP	9/24/07	1210	Soil gas	X	Х	
709528	VI-4-D	9/24/07	1309	Soil gas	X	Х	
709528	VI-4-E	9/24/07	1524	Soil gas	Х	Х	
709557	VI-5-A	9/25/07	831	Soil gas	Х	Х	
709557	VI-5-B	9/25/07	924	Soil gas	Х	Х	
709557	VI-5-C	9/25/07	1204	Soil gas	X	Х	
709557	VI-092507-FB	9/25/07	1344	Soil gas	Х	Х	
709576	VI-10-A	9/2/07	823	Soil gas	Х	Х	X
709576	VI-6-A	9/26/07	1147	Soil gas	Х	Х	X
709576	VI-12-4	9/26/07	1514	Soil gas	Х	Х	X
709608	VI-10-D	9/27/07	1026	Soil gas	Х	Х	Х
709647	VI-11-A	9/28/07	939	Soil gas	X	Х	X
709647	VI-11-A DUP	9/28/07	939	Soil gas	Х	Х	Х
709647	VI-13-A	9/28/07	1241	Soil gas	Х	Х	X
709647	VI-092807-FB	9/28/07	1312	Soil gas	X	Х	X
710035	VI-10-B1	10/1/07	1027	Soil gas	Х		
710035	VI-10-C1	10/1/07	1002	Soil gas	Х		
710035	VI-6-B1	10/1/07	1320	Soil gas	X		
710035	VI-6-CI	10/1/07	1401	Soil gas	Х		
710142	VI-9-A	10/3/07	824	Soil gas	X	Х	Х
710142	VI-9-B	10/3/07	856	Soil gas	Х	Х	X
710142	VI-9-C	10/3/07	1058	Soil gas	X	Х	Х
710142	VI-8-C	10/3/07	1601	Soil gas	X	Х	X
710169	VI-7-A	10/2/07	908	Soil gas	X	Х	X
710169	VI-7-B	10/2/07	932	Soil gas	X	Х	X
710169	VI-7-C	10/2/07	1144	Soil gas	X	X	X
710169	VI-7-C DUP	10/2/07	1144	Soil gas	X	Х	X
710169	VI-7-D	10/2/07	1214	Soil gas	X	X	X
710169	VI-8-A	10/2/07	1435	Soil gas	X	X	X

TABLE A-1
Analytical Results SDGs 709432 - 710169

SDG	Sample ID	Matrix	Parameter	Chemical	Result (µg/m ³)	URS Qual, Code	RL (µg/m ³)
709432	VI-2-D	Soil Gas	TO-15	4-Ethyltoluene	3.7	U,X	3.7
709432	VI-2-B	Soil Gas	TO-15	2-Butanone	1.2	U,X	1.2
709432	VI-2-B	Soil Gas	TO-15	Benzene	1.3	U,X	1.3
709494	VI-4-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	Freon 12	7.8	UJ,L	7.8
709494	VI-4-B	Soil Gas	TO-15	Freon 12	5.5	UJ,L	5.5
709494	VI-3-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	Freon 12	1.5	J,L	0.84
709528	VI-3-B	Soil Gas	TO-15	Freon 12	5.9	J,L	2.0
709528	VI-3-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Freon 12	2.0	UJ,L	2.0
709528	VI-4-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Freon 12	7.5	J,L	3.8
709528	VI-4-C DUP	Soil Gas	TO-15	Freon 12	8.6	J,L	8
709528	VI-4-D	Soil Gas	TO-15	Freon 12	5.3	UJ,L	5.3
709528	VI-4-E	Soil Gas	TO-15	Freon 12	0.81	UJ,L	0.81
709557	VI-5-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	m,p -Xylene	1.8	U,X	1.8
709557	VI-5-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	4-Ethyltoluene	2.1	U,X	2.1
709557	VI-5-B	Soil Gas	TO-15	2-Butanone	4.6	U,X	4.6
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	2-Butanone	0.55	U,X	0.55
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	m,p -Xylene	0.81	U,X	0.81
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	o-Xylene	0.81	U,X	0.81
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	4-Ethyltoluene	0.92	U,X	0.92
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	0.92	U,X	0.92
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Freon 114	3.2	J,S	1.3
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Chloroethane	0.64	J,S	0.49
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Ethanol	23 J	J,S	1.8
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Acetone	85	J,S	2.2
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether	38 J	J,S	0.67
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Hexane	82	J,S	0.66
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	1,1-Dichloroethane	18	J,S	0.76
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	3.1	J,S	0.74
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Cyclohexane	20	J,S	0.64
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Heptane	14	J,S	0.77
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Toluene	100	J,S	0.7
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15	Tetrachloroethane	1.5	J,S	1.3
709557	VI-5-C	Soil Gas	TO-15 SIM	Trichloroethene	0.48	J,S	0.2
709576	VI-12-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	5.7	J,C	0.97
709576	VI-10-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	alpha-Chlorotoluene	1500	UJ,C	1500
709576	VI-10-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether	1100	UJ,C	1100
709576	VI-6-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	alpha-Chlorotoluene	8.8	UJ,C	8.8
709576	VI-6-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether	6.2	UJ,C	6.2
709576	VI-12-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	Ethanol	1.5	UJ,C	1.5
709576	VI-12-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	Methyl tert-butyl ether	0.58	UJ,C	0.58
709576	VI-10-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	2-Butanone	7000	J,C	880
709576	VI-6-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	2-Butanone	5	UJ,C	5
709647	VI-11-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	Acetone	3.8	U,X	3.8
709647	VI-11-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	2-Butanone	0.95	U,X	0.95
709647	VI-11-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	m,p -Xylene	1.4	U,X	1.4
709647	VI-13-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	2-Butanone	0.46	U,X	0.46
709647	VI-13-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	Benzene	0.5	U,X	0.5
709647	VI-13-A	Soil Gas	TO-15	m,p -Xylene	0.69	U,X	0.69

Notes:

Dashed lines indicate a new RL was not required

 $\mu g/m^3 = micrograms \ per \ cubic \ meters$

 $C = Initial \ or \ continuing \ calibration \ \%D \ or \ \%RSD \ outside \ evaluation \ criteria$

 $\boldsymbol{J} = \boldsymbol{Estimated}$

L = Low LCS Recovery

 $S = High \; Surrogate \; Recovery$

 $SIM = Selected \ Ion \ Monitoring$

U = Non-detect

UJ = Estimated non-detect

 $X = Field \; Blank \; Contamination$



Sample Transportation Notice

Relinquishing signature on this document indicates that sample is being shipped in compliance with all applicable local, State, Federal, national, and international laws, regulations and ordinances of any kind. Air Toxics Limited assumes no liability with respect to the collection, handling or shipping of these samples. Relinquishing eighature also indicates agreement to hold harmless, defend, and indemnify Air Toxics Limited against any claim, demand, or action, of any kind, related to the collection, handling, or shipping of samples, D.O.T. Hotlins (300) 467-4922

Collected by: #First and Signs Normal Date: Wall Motor State Military Motor Motor State Military Motor Motor Motor State Military Motor	62 01 11	Service of the servic	ambbuilt or sambi	es. D.O. I. Houn	18 (200) 401-4255			1.149	Ae,	VI
Company (LS Email Address [M) Hornburnds Plaz (N) State H \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	Project Manager 1500 VILINSIVA			Project Inf	o:			' I · .	•	R
Company Maddress (M) Hambards Floadily St. Dulls State M 2 pt 6 10 Project # 2 50 10 8 Project Name A 2 Fload No. He can stee Pressure Vacuum of Collection Analyses Requested Into Project Name A 2 Project Name	Collected by: IFrin: and Signi STAVU MOVE J	My ME	2200	P.O. #				1 .	rized by:	1 red
Address IM Honlands Placity St. IMUS State H D Zip B I D Phone St 429 - Old O Fax 3:4 - 429 - OH6 2 Project Name A 2. Project Name A 2. Time of Collection of Collect	Company WK-> Email _	U					1	Date: _	410	<u> [[U] </u>
Project Name A 2	Address 1001 Haghlands Flaze City St. Loui					-	Rush	Pressu	Mzation	Gas:
Can # of Collection Can # of Can # o	Phone 514 - 429 - 0100 Fax 314 -				&A 2		specify	N	4)	le ·
Can # of Collection Can # of			1 1				Canis	ter Pres	sure/Va	cuum
CA VI - CRIPOT - PB CODE 1098 9-19-07 1042 TO -15 30 5 25 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Lab (LD: Field Sample LD. (Location)	Can#	1 1		Analyses R	equested				
CANTICATION DeterTime Reginquished by: (signature) DeterTime Received by: (signature) Date/Time Heceived by: (signature) Date/Time Heceived by: (signature) Date/Time Heceived by: (signature) Date/Time Heceived by: (signature) Date/Time Received by: (signature) Date/Time Received by: (signature) Date/Time Received by: (signature) Date/Time Cata Shipper Name AI Bill # Temp (°C) Condition Custody Seals Interest Vers. No. (None) Cata Shipper Name	04 VI-2-B	000002511	9-19-07	0929	TO-15	•	3°	5	4214	5 K/16
Concosses 9-19-07 1505 TO-15 Concosses 9-19-07 1505 TO-15 Concosses 9-19-07 1505 TO-15 Concosses 9-19-07 1705 Concosses 9-19-07 1505 Concosses 9-	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1							7	254	Augus
Received by: (signature) Billinguished by: (signature) Dete/Time Ali Bill # Temp (°C) Condition Custody Seals Intage? Work Ordor # Use To A Seals Market Ali Date Testinguished by: (signature) Dete/Time Received by: (signature) Dete/Time Received by: (signature) Dete/Time Received by: (signature) Dete/Time Peocleved by: (signature) Dete/Time Dete/Time								5	7.5 M	, V
Received by: (signature)				:			· 		1	: :
Received by: (signature)				1			i	[!	•••••	
Received by: (signature)			!	:					· . ·	<u> </u>
Refinquished by: (signature) Date/Time Received by: (signature) Date/Time Notes:			i							ļ.
Refinquished by: (signature) Date/Time Received by: (signature) Date/Time Notes:	(2) (2) (4) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1						 ···	1		
Refinquished by: (signature) Date/Time Received by: (signature) Date/Time Received by: (signature) Date/Time Received by: (signature) Date/Time Received by: (signature) Date/Time Received by: (signature) Date/Time Date/Time	A Company	1								: :
Refinquished by: (signature) Date/Time Received by: (signature) Date/Time Received by: (signature) Date/Time Received by: (signature) Date/Time Received by: (signature) Date/Time Received by: (signature) Date/Time Date/Time	A		;	:						<u> </u>
Use I 2 5 V 8707-389 0424 NA Casal Yes No (None) 6706400	Balinquished by: (signature) Date/Time	Received by	VCQ ON by: (signature)	SEN_A						
Use I 2 5 V 8707-389 0424 NA Casal Yes No (None) 6706400	Lab Shipper Name Air Bill	#	Temp (º/	C) · C	Condition (Justody Se	als Intact?	Work O	rdor:#	
	Use 12 5 9207 3801	, વયરમ	AM	- 1		·······		<u> </u>	<u> 709</u>	432

Air Toxics LTD.

CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY RECORD

Sample Transportation Notice
Felinquishing signature on this occurrent Indicates that sample is being shipped in compliance with all applicable local, State, Federal, national, and international laws, regulations and ordinances of any kind. Air Toxics Limited assumes no liability with respect to the collection, handling or shipping of these samples. Rel riquishing signature also indicates agreement to hold harmless, defend, and indemnify Air Toxics Limited against any claim, demand, or action, of any kind, related to the collection, handling, or shipping of samples, D.O.T. Hotline (800) 467-4922

180 BLUE RAVINE ROAD, SUITE B FOLSOM, CA 95630-4719 (916) 985-1000 FAX (916) 985-1020

Page of

Project Manager 305 VILISTO			Project Infe	0:		Turn Areu	ınd ia	ab Use On	hy.	7 9
Collected by: Print and Sign) Survey Marke	ugher					Time:	- 1	ressuri	zed by:	#
Company URC Corp Email	()		P.O. #	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		☐ Norma	ם י	ate: _	9/2	401
Address DD High God Phzady City St. LONG	State MO	Zip V31[0	Project # <u>Z</u>	1561683		Rush] [2	Yessuyi	zation (ies:
	429-044		Project Name	5AZ			— <u>]</u> .	N,) He	.:`; ∌
		Date	Time				nister	Press	ure/Vac	:uum
Lab I.D. Field Sample I.D. (Location)	Can #	of Collection	of Collection	Analyses	Requested	Init	ial F	inel 1	Receipt	Final
0/A VI -4 - A	<u> </u>	9-21-07	0838	70-15	··· ,	3	0	54	1911	4/14
074 VI -4-B	013656	1	1007	TD-15		2	0.	54	1.1916	
NA VI-012107-F8	101104000	7	1022	T8-15		31		34	510	
*01A: VI-3-A	()2000/357)	V	14/2	10-15		30	1	5 1	06/1	
					<u> </u>				* (M)	
\$40 A								-		
					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
								. -	i	
										——
				*						
Relinquished by: (signature) Date/Time	Received by	ζ (signature)	Date/Time		Notes:	L				-
			FTC 9/24	1/07-08300						
Relinquished by: (signature) Date/Time	Received by	: (signature)	Date/Time	'						
Relinquished by: (signature) Date/Time	Received by	r: (signature)	Date/Time							
Lab Snipper Name Air Bill		Temp (°C	E) C	ondition	Custody Sea	ils intact?	w	ork Ort	icr#	•
Use Fed Ex 8606389199	504	NA	- -	zord	Yes No	None		07 O	945	14
e eta ea			Ļ	J		• •	~	- 4 44	- A	•

Sample Transportation Notice
Relicquishing signature or this ducument indicates that sample is being shipped in compliance with all applicable local, State, Federal, national, and international laws, regulations and ordinances of any kiral. Air Toxics Limited assumes no hability with respect to the collection, handling or shipping of these samples. Relinquishing agneture also indicates agreement to hold harmless, defend, and indemnify Air Toxics Limited against any claim, demand, or action, of any kind, related to the collection, randling, or shipping of samples, D.O.T. Hotine (800) 467-4922

Project Man	ager 3500 Velustra				T 	'		· =
	(Print and Sign) Sherry Neore	Mu. More	Project Info:		Turn Around Time:	Lab.Use Dray	ed by VF2	4
Company / J	LS Coro Email	-	F.O. #		Normal		9/26/01	,
Address 100	1 Highland Place St. LDW	State MO zin/63 //	Project # 2/5	521683	□ Rush		ation Gas:	ĺ
Phone 3/4	-429-0100 Fax 314	-429-0462	Project Namo			riessung.	allon Gas:). He	
de l'Ti	Field Committee of	Date	Time		spenity Canist	ter Pressu	re/Vacuum	1
Lab I.D.	Field Sample I.D. (Location)	Can # of Collec	tion of Collection	Analyses Requested	Initial	Final R		1
1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -	II-3-B	000002476 9-24	101 OSHIL	TO-15	30		04 5.0	1251
レニコーハー	<u>/I -3-C</u>	000002591	0934		27	 	Onta 1	
31 24 4	1 <u>I-4-c</u>	020002965	1210		30	-	5 16	
O #4 V	II-4-c Duf	436	1210		30		-0%H	ļ
	II-4-D	000000963	1309		50		2014	
XXXX	<u>1I-4-E</u>	000002288 V	1524	→	30	5 5	5/4 V	
				\ <u></u>			77	
					-		:	
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
PSion lead	by: (signature) Date/Time							
Alley	10, signature) Date; rime 1, 3407 /76	Heceived by: (aignature	Date/Time	Notes:		<u> </u>		ĺ
Relinquistica	by: (signature) Date/Time	Received by: (signature	Date/Time	1 9/25/57 845				
Relinquished	by: (signature) Date/Time	Received by: (signature	e) Date/Time					
	hipper Name Air Bi	II.# Temp	o (eC) Cond	ition Custody Sea				
Use Co	d. Ex 8606389			ition Custody Sea Yes No		Work Orde	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Only T			+ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ies do	NOTE !	070 (9528	

Air Toxics LTD.

CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY RECORD

Sample Transportation Notice

Relinquishing signature on this document indicates that sample is being shipped in compliance with all applicable local. State, Federal, national, and international awa, regulations and ordinances of any kind. Air Toxics Limited assumes no liability with respect to the collection, hand inglor shipping of these samples. Relinquishing agneture also indicates agreement to hold hamiless, defend, and indemntily Air Toxics Limited against any calm, demand, or aution, of any kind, related to the collection. Receiving as shipping of samples DOT Halling (RDO) 467-4022 collection, handling, or shipping of samples, D.C.T. Hulling (800) 467-4922

Project Manager DD Y LLINSTIA		· <u>····</u>	Project Info		Turn Arou	and Lab	Use Only	iA)
Collected by: (Print and Sign) Shary Moore/S	Alumla				Time:		ssurized)by	12
Company WPS Corp Email	* 0		P.C. #		Æ KNorma	ll Dat	te: <u>912</u> 9	5/117
Acdress 1001 theh Ward Fuzz Droty St. (DW.s	State M.D	zio63110	Project # Z/	1561683	☐ Rush	Pre	ssurization	Gas:
	6-429-1		Project Name	SA2	spcoity		A	8
		Date	Time		<u> </u>	nister P	ressure/Va	
Lab l.D. Field Sample I.D. (Location)	Can#	of Collection	of Collection	Analyses Requested	Init	tial Fin	al Receipt	Final
04 VI -5-A	00000300	9-25-07	0831	-10-15	24.	5 3	1000	4//
67A VI-5-B	000001893	l'	0924	1		05	4.01	
03A VI-S-C	£9000 is 44		1204		30			
Pater : -	000003942		1344	7	28			
		-		•	100	13 - W		
				, <u> </u>		-	• :	
						<u>.</u>	· · · ·	
1							1	
Reinquished by (signature) Date/Time	Received by	/: (signatpike)	Date/Time	Notes:			<u> </u>	
Jelly 92507/130	Men	ica lare	Den AT	1 9265 840 Sud				
Relinquished by: (signature) Date/Time	Received by	r: (signature)	Date/Time					
Relinquished by: (signature) Date/Time	Baseline							
THERE ADDITION OF FRIGHTING PRINK LINE	neceived by	: (signature)	Date/Time					
Lab Shipper Name Air Bill	#;	Temp (°C	C) Co	ndition Custody Sea	ds Intact?	Win	k Order#	
USB TO 1 SV QUAY 3891 C		MA		Yes No			7095	
Cirily	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1 -7 50-1			-		: VBU	, t

Air Toxics LTD.

CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY RECORD

12 n - 1/20 - 1	was controlled the same of the	subbusion serub	es. D.C. I. Hatti	18 (6CG) 467-4322	<u>2</u> .		1 6	r	<i>"</i>	
Project Manager <u>Bob Volust</u>			Project Inf	o:		Turn Around	Lạo Use		1	1
Collected by: (Primand Sign) SNUTY Me	ene XIVI		1125 #			Time:		unzed by:		
Company WS COCO	Email		F.O. #			Normai	Date:	9/2	201	ĺ
Adorses 1001 Highlands Phys. Bity S				156168		☐ Rush	Press	unzation (as:	
Phore 34-419-0100 F	ex <u>314-459-04</u>	62	Project Nam	SAZ		epecity		N) · · · Hi	<u>.</u>	
labin Fill Committee Comm		Date	Time			Canis	ter Pre	ssure/Vac	աստ	
Lab I.D. Field Sample I.D. (Locat	ioл) Can #	of Collection	of Collection	Analy	ses Requested	Initial	Final	Receipt.	Final	ĺ
DIA VI -ID-A	(000000417	9/26/02	0823	TD-15	(Oxugen)) ජී0	4	3.04	5-00	ß
10 B	00000165	/						<u>ل</u> :		Ĺ
DIA VI-6-A	0800038	926/02	1147	10-15	(OX4Gen)	30	¥	6.5H	5.0	22.
1034 VI-12-A	943.00	V	1514	10-15	(Oxuger)	30	6	500	1/	Γ
	ı									ı
							!	· .		l
	` ***	, <u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>				_			•	l
								: ::	3	İ
		 	-		·					
	" = "	·				-				ĺ
Relinguished by: (signature) Date√rime	Received by	y: (signatyte)	Date/Time	- 04	/ Notes:					l
Milly 9/24/07	1700 1 lon	ucalino	OPPLIA A	7L 8300	ปลาโฮา					
Reinquished by: (signature) Date:Time		y: (signature) (,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,					
Relinquished by: (signature) Date:Time	 Received by	y: (signature)	Date/Time							
Lab Skipper Nanie	Air Bril #	Temp (°(D) (C	ondition	Custody.Sea	ils Intect?	Work (Order#		
Use Tol Sv 92 No	3891 9489	-MA	(Les	2	Yes No			9578		
Only:		- 130						Tes Tes		İ



Sample Transportation Notice
Relinquishing signature on this document Indicates that sample is being shipped in compliance with all applicable local, State, Federal, national, and international laws, regulations and ordinances of any kind. Air Toxica Limited assumes no idality with respect to the collection, handling or shipping of these samples. Relinquishing signature also incloates agreement to hold harmless, detend, and indemnify Air Toxics Limited against any claim, demand, or action, of any kind, related to the collection, handling are chinging of samples. D.O.T. Hotting (Mrth 487-4022)

	كالكاري في المسين	ndemnify Air Toxic dion, handling, or	s L.mited against shipping of samp	i any olaim, dema les. D.O.T. Hotlin	and, or action, of an le (200) 467-4922	ry kind, related to th	léi	Ρa	age <u> </u>	of	
	anager 506 VILINS Fra	<i>l.</i>		Project inf			Turn Around Time:	Lab Use Press	Only Urized by:	Vin]
Compary <u>I</u>	by: (Print and Sign) NIVY Moore &	Think T		P.O. #			Normal	Date:	~ ~ /.	a Ini	
_	المنافق المناف	300	1 #2 (d. / \)	Project #2	<u>1561683</u>		□Rush		-	720/	
	J 1/05 01-13 -	S_State MO	Zip <u>@:30[\Q</u>					Press	urization (∡∂	·	
NONE 2	4- 42-1-4180 Fex		1	Project Nam	e I		epacity	.(N ₂) Ηε		
Lab I.D.	Field Sample I.D. (Location)	Can #	Date of Collection	Time of Collection	<u> </u>	es Requested	Canis Initial	ter Pre: Final	ssure/Vac		ļ
(tc	VI-10-D	- m - 5 - 00/6 6		!	سعين راس			- KIUET	Receipt		
<u> </u>	VI -10-0	0.000002818	1-21-21	1026	70-13	(+ Oxy)	3D_	8	1.04	750	05.
	,				-					<u></u> :	
	1		: 				•				
			•								
		-				······································					
							į				İ
							;			: .	
				•							
Alles	ec by: (signature) Date/Time 1/27-07 1600 ec by: (signature) Date/Time	Mpm	– ,,	Date/Time Date/Time	n abston	Notes: 045 D					
Relinquish	ed by: (signature) Date/Time	Received by	/: (signature)	Date/Time							
Lab	Shipper Name Air Bill		lemp (भ		ondition	Custody Sea	als Intact?	.Work (Order#	•	
Use Only	Hearty 860635	219497) MA	- Ge	10d	Yes No	None (170	9608		



Sample Transportation Notice
Relinquishing signature on this document indicates that sample is being shipped in compliance with all applicable local, State, Federal, national, and international laws, regulations and ordinances of any kind. Air Toxics Limited assumes no liability with respect to the collection, handling or shipping of these samples. Relinquishing signature also indicates agreement to hold harmless, defend, and indemnify Air Toxics Limited against any claim, demand, or action, of any kind, related to the collection, handling, or shipping of samples. D.O.T. Hotline (800) 467-4922

		Jon, nanding, or	ampping or samp	Jies. D.O. I. HOUIII	6 (000) 407-4922					<u> </u>	-, -+
Project Ma	anager 30h VIIIISTO			Project Info	o:			Around me:	Lab Use (19
Collected b	by: (Print and Sign) Shemy Moore S	THH INE	30/-	P.O. #						urized by	
	WRS COYD, Email _	4			14 11 00		No.		Date:	10121	<u> </u>
Address D	Ol Highlands Plazacity St. Louis	State ND	Zip63110		1561683		☐ Ru	ısh	Pressi	urization	Gas:
Phone 3	4-429-0100 Fax 314.	-429-04	162	Project Name	. <u>5A-2</u>		sı	pecify		N ₂) H	е
Lab I.D.	Field Sample I.D. (Location)	Onn #	Date	Time			,		,	ssure/Va	
	Field Sample I.D. (Location)	Can #	of Collection	of Collection	Analyses	s Requested	ASTM.	Initial	Final	Receipt	Final (psi)
O/A	VI-11-A	000003447	7 9-28-07	0939	10-15	FOYGOL	N999	30	5	501/	5.00
02A	VI-11-A DUP	4588		0939	70-151	KIM ASTME	nu.	30	5	5.0940	171
03A	VI-13-A	12671		1241			,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	30	5	451	
64A 1	VI-092807-FB	000003172	. 1	1312	V			30	5	5511	1
										10.75	
	·			,							
			77.								
	·										
	.**										
Reinquish	ed-by: (signature) Date/Time	Received b	y: (signature)	Date/Time ,		Notes:	<u></u>			<u> </u>	1
Allu) cM-c	Dona	9/29/07	900						
Relinquishe	ed by: (signature) Date/Time	Received b	y: (signature)	Date/Time							
Relinquishe	ed by: (signature) Date/Time	Received b	y: (signature)	Date/Time							
Lab	Shipper Name Air Bill	#.	Temp (°0	C) C	Condition	Custody Sea	als Inte	çt?		Order#	
Control of the Control	edex 86063891945	.6	NA	9000	1	Yes No	No	pe	07	096	47
Othy				J		***					



Sample Transportation Notice
Relinquishing signature on this document indicates that earrible is being shipped in compliance with all applicable local, State, Federal, national, and international laws, regulations and ordinances of any kind. Air Toxics Limited assumes no liability with respect to the collection, bandling or shipping of these samples. Pelinquishing signature also indicates agreement to hold hamiless, defend, and indemnify Air Toxics Limited against any claim, demand, or action, of any kind, related to the

A Charles Sangara

17m	la il fere sel co	anon, nanaming. J.	and build on seaut	ursa. w.w. L. Mulli. IE	i fonni ⇒ot⊸sass					3- }		•
Project Manager 49	DICINSTA			Project Info	:		Turn A	round	Lab t¦se (Ontr	1/5	,]
a a	Shurry Moore Sh	my hea		P.O. #			Tin		Presst	uńzed by: "A C	<u> </u>	t
Company UCS	Email				<u></u>		☐ Nor		Date:	10/2	107	1
Address 00 Hanland 31	Plaza de city St Louis	state MO	Zp63110	Project # 🔏	561683		Rus		Pressu	urization (Gas:	ł
Phone	Fax	•		Project Name	42		5-t			N, Hi	 Q	
			Date	Time					ter Pres	sure/Va	cuum	1
Lab I.D. Field Sar	mple I.D. (Location)	Can #		of Collection	Analyse	s Requested	-	Initial	Final	Receipt	Final.	1
8A VI-10	-81	35636	10-1-07	1027	TO-15	Duad	i.	30	5	4.04	4/5.	00
020 NI-10-		000002147	1	1002				<u>3</u> 0		4.50		
DBA VI-6		00000274		1320				29		6.09	7	
DAY VI-6		0000005/1		1401	$\neg \forall$			ク ダ	Ž	600		1
		Para Para Para Para Para Para Para Para	, v	//-/	V			<u>~</u> 0		(00 ()	HAV	1
	•			<u> </u>						•		1
												1
								v. 177			•••	ł
			117 - VII								<u> </u>	1
	N day							l			<u> </u>	1
Contract inhand they (nignated	ei Pete/E	·						į			•••	4
Relinguished by: (signaturi	e) Date/Tine 10-1-87 1480		y: (signature) WA T	Date/Time	ANT 10/2 }	Notes:						
Rounquished by: (signature			y: (signature)		#X\[1600						
0 , (0 ,	5,	11005/703/0	, r (a.g.manno)	D LEVIS 1 11110								
Relinquished by: (signature	e) Date/Time	Received by	y: (signature)	Date/Time								
Lab Shipper Nam	e Air Bi	<u> </u>	Town /	10\ C.		2		10	We de d	N_J		
Lab Shipper Nam	ים ועי		. Тетр (° 	70)	ondition	Custody Se		N. N		Order#		
Only	100000000	<u>0481 </u>	1914	<u> </u>	ጋ/스	Yes No	Non	<u>e) u</u>	111	0035)	-

TOXICS LTD.

Sample Transportation Notice

Relinquishing signature on this document indicates that sample is being shipped in compliance with all applicable local, State. Faderal, national, and international laws, regulations and ordinances of any kind. Air Toxico Limited assumes no liability with respect to the collection, handling or shipping of those samples. Relinquishing signature also indicates agreement to hold hannisss, delend, and indemnify Air Toxics Limited against any plains, demand, or action, of any kind, related to the

180 BLUE RAVINE ROAD, SUITE B FOLSOM, CA 95630-4719 (916) 985-1000 FAX (916) 985-1020

CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY RECORD collection, handling, or shipping of samples, D.O.T. Hotline (800) 467-4922 Project Manager BOb Vecustra **Turn Around** Project Info: Lab Use Only Collected by: (Print and Sign) Sherry Moore/ Shung Messe Time: Pressurized by: V P.O. # COMDENY URS CORP **™**Normal Project # 2156 1683 Address 100 (Highlands Plazatorcity St. Linus Rush 🗆 StateM & Zip 63110 Pressurization Gas: Phone 314 - 429 - 000 Fax 314-429-0462 Project Name He' specify Date Time Canister Pressure/Vacuum Lab I.D. Field Sample I.D. (Location) of Collection of Collection Can# Analyses Requested Initial Final Receipt Final OIA 0824 000003344 10-3-01 30 15 LHSIM 000002638 0856 26.5 VI-9-C 30 1058 000003464 VI-8-C 1601 20 100000257 Rélincuisaed by: (signature) Date/Time Pecaived by: (signature) _ Date/Time Notes: Received by: (signature) Date/Time Relinquished by: (signature) Date/Time Received by: (s.gnature) Date/Time Shipper Neme . Air Bill# ... Temp (°C) Custody Seals Intact? Condition Work Order # Use Yes No Only

DXICS LTD.

CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY RECORD

Sample Transportation Notice
Relinquishing signature on this document indicates that eample is being shipped in compliance with all applicable local, State, Federal, reticoal, and international laws, regulations and ordinances of any kind. Air Toxics Limited assumes no liability with respect to the collection, handling or shipping of these samples. Relinquishing signature also indicates agreement to hold harmless, defend, and indemnity Air Toxics Limited against any claim, demand, or action, of any kind, related to the

Page _ collection, handling, or shipping of samples, D.O.T. Hortine (800) 467-4922 Project Manager 1800 V LLL WY Project Info: Turn Around Lab Use Only Collected by: (Print and Sign) SALTCU MOON Time: Pressurized:by Normal Project # 2156/683 ☐ Rush 5 State NO Zp 1810 Pressunzation Gas Project Name Specify Date Canister Pressure/Vacuum Time Lab LD. Field Sample I.D. (Location) Can # of Collection of Collection **Analyses Requested** Final Receipt Final 01000305 0908 Sepol 162 Paynoutstree by (signature) Date/Time Received by: (algoature) Date/Time Notes: Allha Mister Relinquistud by: (signature) DeterTime Received by: (signature) Date/Time Relinquished by: (signature) Date/Time Received by: (signature) Date/Time Shipper Name Air Bli #: Temp (°C) ··· Condition Custody Seals Intact2 Work Order # Yes

.º/13

S

Fism 1298 roc11

DATA VALIDATION WORKSHEET VOLATILE ORGANIC ANALYSIS

Reviewer:	Steve Gragert		Project Name:	Sauget - Area 2 Air Sampling
Date:	11/15/2007		Project Number:	21561683.80012
Laboratory	Air Toxics		SDG No.:	0710169
			Review Level:	Level III
Major Anome	olies:			_
	No samples were rejected			
				_
•				
Minor Anome	olies:			
	No analytes required qualification b	ased on this data review.		
	7 1			_
•				
Field IDs:	VI-7-B	VI-7-A		
	VI-7-C	VI-8-A		
	VI-7-C DUP	VI-7-D		

1.0 Chain of Custody/Sample Condition

			Yes	No	NA
	1.1	Do Chain-of-Custody forms list all samples analyzed?	X		
	1.2	Are all Chain-of-Custody forms signed, indicating sample chain-of-custody was maintained?	X		
$\ \ $	1.3	Do the Traffic Reports, chain-of-custody, and lab narrative indicate any problems with sample receipt,			
L		condition of samples, analytical problems or special circumstances affecting the quality of the data?		X	

Note: No issues were noted in the laboratory case narrative or cooler receipt forms.

2.0 Holding Time/ Preservation (Code H)

		Yes	No	NA
2.1	Do sample preservation, collection and storage condition meet method requirement?	X		
	If sample preservation and/or temperature was inappropriate (i.e., $<2^{\circ}>6^{\circ}$ C, etc.), comment in repunpreserved or temperature is outside the range 0° (but not frozen) to 10° flag all positive results "J" and all non-detects "UJ". If temperature exceeds 10° , flag positive detections "J" and non-detects	with a		
2.2	Have any technical holding times, determined from sampling to date of analysis, been exceeded? $J(+)/UJ(-)$.	If yes,	X	
	Matrix Preserved Holding Time		-	
	Air No 14 days			
2.3	Have any technical holding times been grossly (twice the holding time) exceeded? If yes, J(+)/R(-	-).	X	

Note: All holding time criteria were met.

3.0 GC/MS Instrument Performance Check (Code T)

			Yes	No	NA
3.	1 Are GC/MS	Cuning and Mass Calibration forms present for bromofluorobenzene (BFB)?			X
3.	2 Have all sam	oles been analyzed within twelve hours of the BFB tune? If no, flag R.			X
3.	Have ion abu	ndance criteria for BFB been met for each instrument used? If no, flag R.			X

Note:

4.0 Blanks (Method Blanks, Field Blanks and Trip Blanks)

(Code X - Field Blank Contamination, Code Y - Trip blank contamination, Code Z - Method blank contamination

		Yes	No	NA
4.1	Is a Method Blank Summary form present for each batch?	X		
4.2	Do any method blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
4.3	Do any field/trip rinse/equipment blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
	Action: Positive sample results <5X (or 10X for common volatile lab contaminants- methylene chloride, acetone, and 2-butanone) the blank concentration should be qualified "U". The result should be elevated the RL for estimate (laboratory "J" flagged) concentrations.			
4.4	If Level IV, review raw data and verify all detections for blanks were reported.			X

Note: All blank criteria were met.

5.0 GC/MS Initial Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
5.1	Are Initial Calibration summary forms present and complete for each instrument used?			X
5.2	Are CCCs linear applying either %RSD < 30% and all other compounds <15% or >0.990?			X
	If not, J(+)/ UJ(-). In extreme cases, the reviewer may flag non-detects "R".			
5.3	Do any SPCC compounds have an RRF less than specification or any other compounds < 0.05 (use 0.01			
	for poor responders like ketones or alcohols)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$.			X
5.4	Is the lowest standard at the same concentration, or lower, as the RL reported? If not, elevate RL.			X
5.5	If Level IV, recalculate a sample of RRFs and %RSDs to verify correct calculations are being made.			X

Note:

6.0 Continuing Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
6.1	Are Continuing Calibration Summary forms present and complete?			X
6.2	Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours?			X
6.3	Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4.			X
6.4	Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial ar continuing calibration RRF outside QC limits (%D < 20%)?			X
	If yes, a marginal increase in response >20% then $J(+)$ only; a decrease in response then $J(+)/UJ(-)$. For %D > 50%, flag R.			
6.5	Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$.	·		X
6.6	If Level IV, calculate a sample of RFs and %Ds from ave RF to verify correct calculations.			X

Note:

7.0 Surrogate Recovery (Code S)

					Yes	No	NA
7.1	Are all sampl	es listed on the a	ppropriate Surrogate Recovery Su	ımmary Form ?	X		
7.2	Are surrogate	recoveries withi	in acceptance criteria specified in	the QAPP for all samples?	X		
7.3	If No in Secti	on 7.2, were the	se sample(s) or method blank(s) re	eanalyzed?			X
7.4	If No in Secti	If No in Section 7.3, is any sample dilution factor greater than 10? (Surrogate recoveries may be diluted			be diluted		
	out.)						X
	Note: If SMO	C recoveries do n	ot meet acceptance criteria in san	ples chosen for the MS/MSD	or diluted		
		> UCL	10% to LCL	< 10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			

Note: All surrogate recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

8.0 Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) or one MS with a Sample Duplicate (Recovery - Code M, RPD - Code D)

		Yes	No	NA
8.1	Is a Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate recovery form present?		X	
8.2	Are MS/MSDs analyzed at the required frequency of one matrix spike per ten samples and a duplicate per	•		
6.2	twenty for each matrix?			X
8.3	Are all MS/MSD %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria Specified in the QAPP?			X
	Using informed professional judgment, the data reviewer should use the MS and MSD results in			
	conjunction with other QC criteria and determine the need for qualification of the data for samples com			
	the same site/matrix. Recoveries <10% may require rejection. RPD failures may be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: MS/MSD samples were not submitted for analysis.

9.0 Laboratory Control Sample (LCS/LCSD) (Recovery - Code L, RPD - Code E)

		Yes	No	NA
9.1	Is an LCS recovery form present?	X		
9.2	Is an LCS analyzed at the required frequency of one per twenty field samples for each matrix?			
9.3	Are all LCS %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP?	X		
9.4	If Level IV, verify the % recoveries are calculated correctly.	X		
	Action for specific compound outside the acceptance criteria: %R>UCL,			
	J(+) only; $<$ LCL, $J(+)/UJ(-)$; $<$ 30% $J(+)/R(-)$. RPD failures should be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: All LCS recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

10.0 Internal Standards (Code I)

					Yes	No	NA
10.1	Are internal stand	lard areas for every sample	and blank within upper and	lower QC limits?	X		
		Area $> +100\%$	Area < -50%	Area < -10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			
Note:	· ·	1 0	,	pecifications are met for a given not to flag individual samples			
10.2			hin 30 seconds of the associ		X		
	Action: The chromatogram must be examined to determine if any false positives or negatives exist. F shift of a large magnitude, the reviewer may consider partial or total rejection of the data for non-detects that sample/fraction.						

Note: Internal standard area counts and retention times were within evaluation criteria.

11.0 TCL Identification (Code W)			No	NA
11.1	Is the relative retention time (RRT) of each reported compound within 0.06 RRT units of the standard			
	RRT in the continuing calibration?			X
11.2	Are the three ions of greatest intensity present in the standard mass spectrum also present in the sample			
	mass spectrum; and do sample and standard relative ion intensities agree within 30%?			X
Note:				

12.0 TCL/TIC Quantitation and Reported Detection limits (Code K) Yes No NA Are RLs used consistent with those specified in the QAPP X 12.2 Are these limits adjusted to reflect dilutions and/ or percent solids as required? X 12.3 Are TIC ions greater than ten percent in the reference spectrum also present in the sample spectrum? X Are any positives reported that exceed the linear range of the instrument? If yes, than flag "J". 12.4 X If Level IV, calculate a sample of positive results to verify correct calculation 12.5 X

Note:

13.0 Field Duplicate Samples (Code F)				NA
13.1	Were any field duplicates submitted for VOC analysis	X		
13.2	Were all RPD or absolute difference values within the control limits outlined in the QAPP?	X		
	Action: No qualifying action is taken based on field duplicate results, however the data validator shou			
	provide a qualitative assessment in the data validation report.			

Note: Sample VI-7-C DUP was a field duplicate of sample VI-7-C. Both samples were analyzed for TO-15 Full Scan and Oxygen.

14.0 Data Completeness

			Yes	No	NA
14.1	Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check Q	APP or use 95% for aqueous sample	X		
14.2	Number of samples: 6			3	
14.3	Number of target compounds in each analysis 60				
14.4	Number of results rejected and not reported 0				
	% Completeness = 100 x ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)				
	% Completeness	100			

Note:

DATA VALIDATION WORKSHEET VOLATILE ORGANIC ANALYSIS

Reviewer	Steve Gragert	Project Name:	Sauget - Area 2 Air Sampling
Date:	11/15/2007	Project Number:	21561683.80012
Laboratory	Air Toxics	SDG No.:	0710142
		Review Level:	Level III
Major Anom	olies:		
	No samples were rejected		
Minor Anom	olies:		
	No analytes required qualification	pased on this data review.	
Field IDs:	VI-9-A		
	VI-9-B		
	VI-9-C		
	VI-8-C		

1.0 Chain of Custody/Sample Condition

_			Yes	No	NA
	1.1	Do Chain-of-Custody forms list all samples analyzed?	X		
	1.2	Are all Chain-of-Custody forms signed, indicating sample chain-of-custody was maintained?	X		
	1.3 Do the Traffic Reports, chain-of-custody, and lab narrative indicate any problems with sample receipt,				
		condition of samples, analytical problems or special circumstances affecting the quality of the data?		X	

Note: No issues were noted in the laboratory case narrative or cooler receipt forms.

2.0 Holding Time/ Preservation (Code H)

		Yes	No	NA
2.1	Do sample preservation, collection and storage condition meet method requirement?			
	If sample preservation and/or temperature was inappropriate (i.e., $<2^{\circ}>6^{\circ}$ C, etc.), comment in report. I unpreserved or temperature is outside the range 0° (but not frozen) to 10° flag all positive results with a "J" and all non-detects "UJ". If temperature exceeds 10° , flag positive detections "J" and non-detects "F	ı		
2.2	Have any technical holding times, determined from sampling to date of analysis, been exceeded? If yes $J(+)/UJ(-)$.	,	x	
	Matrix Preserved Holding Time		•	
	Air No 14 days			
2.3	Have any technical holding times been grossly (twice the holding time) exceeded? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$.		X	

Note: All holding time criteria were met.

3.0 GC/MS Instrument Performance Check (Code T)

		Yes	No	NA
3.1	Are GC/MS Tuning and Mass Calibration forms present for bromofluorobenzene (BFB)?			X
3.2	Have all samples been analyzed within twelve hours of the BFB tune? If no, flag R.			X
3.3	Have ion abundance criteria for BFB been met for each instrument used? If no, flag R.			X

Note:

4.0 Blanks (Method Blanks, Field Blanks and Trip Blanks)

(Code X - Field Blank Contamination, Code Y - Trip blank contamination, Code Z - Method blank contamination

		Yes	No	NA
4.1	Is a Method Blank Summary form present for each batch?	X		
4.2	Do any method blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
4.3	Do any field/trip rinse/equipment blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?			X
Action: Positive sample results <5X (or 10X for common volatile lab contaminants- methylene chloride, acetone, and 2-butanone) the blank concentration should be qualified "U". The result should be elevated the RL for estimate (laboratory "J" flagged) concentrations.				
4.4	If Level IV, review raw data and verify all detections for blanks were reported.			X

Note: All blank criteria were met.

5.0 GC/MS Initial Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
5.1	Are Initial Calibration summary forms present and complete for each instrument used?			X
5.2	Are CCCs linear applying either %RSD < 30% and all other compounds <15% or >0.990?			X
	If not, J(+)/UJ(-). In extreme cases, the reviewer may flag non-detects "R".			
5.3	Do any SPCC compounds have an RRF less than specification or any other compounds < 0.05 (use 0.01			
	for poor responders like ketones or alcohols)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$.			X
5.4	Is the lowest standard at the same concentration, or lower, as the RL reported? If not, elevate RL.			X
5.5	If Level IV, recalculate a sample of RRFs and %RSDs to verify correct calculations are being made.			X

Note:

6.0 Continuing Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
6.1	Are Continuing Calibration Summary forms present and complete?			X
6.2	Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours?			X
6.3	Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4.			X
6.4	Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial ar continuing calibration RRF outside QC limits (%D < 20%)?			X
	If yes, a marginal increase in response >20% then $J(+)$ only; a decrease in response then $J(+)/UJ(-)$. For $D > 50\%$, flag R.			
6.5	Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$.			X
6.6	If Level IV, calculate a sample of RFs and %Ds from ave RF to verify correct calculations.			X

Note:

7.0 Surrogate Recovery (Code S)

					Yes	No	NA
7.1	Are all sampl	es listed on the a	ppropriate Surrogate Recovery Su	ımmary Form ?	X		
7.2	Are surrogate	recoveries withi	in acceptance criteria specified in	the QAPP for all samples?	X		
7.3	7.3 If No in Section 7.2, were these sample(s) or method blank(s) reanalyzed?						X
7.4	7.4 If No in Section 7.3, is any sample dilution factor greater than 10? (Surrogate recoveries may be diluted				be diluted		
	out.)						X
	Note: If SMO	C recoveries do n	ot meet acceptance criteria in san	ples chosen for the MS/MSD	or diluted		
		> UCL	10% to LCL	< 10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			

Note: All surrogate recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

8.0 Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) or one MS with a Sample Duplicate (Recovery - Code M, RPD - Code D)

		Yes	No	NA
8.1	Is a Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate recovery form present?		X	
8.2	Are MS/MSDs analyzed at the required frequency of one matrix spike per ten samples and a duplicate per	•		
0.2	twenty for each matrix?			X
8.3	Are all MS/MSD %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria Specified in the QAPP?			X
	Using informed professional judgment, the data reviewer should use the MS and MSD results in			
	conjunction with other QC criteria and determine the need for qualification of the data for samples com			
	the same site/matrix. Recoveries <10% may require rejection. RPD failures may be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: MS/MSD samples were not submitted for analysis.

9.0 Laboratory Control Sample (LCS/LCSD) (Recovery - Code L, RPD - Code E)

		Yes	No	NA
9.1	Is an LCS recovery form present?	X		
9.2	Is an LCS analyzed at the required frequency of one per twenty field samples for each matrix?	X		
9.3	Are all LCS %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP?	X		
9.4	If Level IV, verify the % recoveries are calculated correctly.			X
	Action for specific compound outside the acceptance criteria: %R>UCL,			
	J(+) only; $<$ LCL, $J(+)/UJ(-)$; $<$ 30% $J(+)/R(-)$. RPD failures should be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: All LCS recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

10.0 Internal Standards (Code I)

					Yes	No	NA
10.1	Are internal stand	Are internal standard areas for every sample and blank within upper and lower QC limits?					
	Area > +100% Area < -50% Area < -10%						
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			
Note:	ote: calibration, not sample to continuing calibration. Thus, if all other QC specifications are met for a given sample, using informed professional judgment, the reviewer may choose not to flag individual samples in this case.						
10.2					X		
	shift of a large m	Are retention times of internal standards within 30 seconds of the associated calibration standard? Action: The chromatogram must be examined to determine if any false positives or negatives exist. F shift of a large magnitude, the reviewer may consider partial or total rejection of the data for non-detects in that sample/fraction.					

Note: Internal standard area counts and retention times were within evaluation criteria.

11.0 TCL Identification (Code W)			Yes	No	NA
1	11.1	Is the relative retention time (RRT) of each reported compound within 0.06 RRT units of the standard			
		RRT in the continuing calibration?			X
1	11.2	Are the three ions of greatest intensity present in the standard mass spectrum also present in the sample			
		mass spectrum; and do sample and standard relative ion intensities agree within 30%?			X

Note:

12.0 TCL/TIC Quantitation and Reported Detection limits (Code K)				NA
12.1	Are RLs used consistent with those specified in the QAPP			X
12.2	Are these limits adjusted to reflect dilutions and/ or percent solids as required?			X
12.3	Are TIC ions greater than ten percent in the reference spectrum also present in the sample spectrum?			X
12.4	Are any positives reported that exceed the linear range of the instrument? If yes, than flag "J".			X
12.5	If Level IV, calculate a sample of positive results to verify correct calculation			X

Note:

_1	3.0 Field D	ruplicate Samples (Code F)	Yes	No	NA
I	13.1	Were any field duplicates submitted for VOC analysis		X	
	13.2	Were all RPD or absolute difference values within the control limits outlined in the QAPP?			X
		Action: No qualifying action is taken based on field duplicate results, however the data validator shou			
		provide a qualitative assessment in the data validation report.			

Note: Field duplicate samples were not submitted for analysis.

14.0 Data Completeness

			Yes	No	NA
14.1	Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check Q	APP or use 95% for aqueous sample	X		
14.2	Number of samples:	4	·		•
14.3	Number of target compounds in each analysis	60	ì		
14.4	Number of results rejected and not reported	0	ì		
	% Completeness = $100 \times ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)$		ì		
	% Completeness	100	<u> </u>		
Note:					

I:\CHEM\Sauget_Solutia\Level III\SDG SAS052.xls 4of4

DATA VALIDATION WORKSHEET VOLATILE ORGANIC ANALYSIS

Reviewer:	Steve Gragert	Project Name:	Sauget - Area 2 Air Sampling
Date:	11/15/2007	Project Number:	21561683.80012
Laboratory	Air Toxics	SDG No.:	0710035
-		Review Level:	Level III
Major Anomo	olies:		_
_	No samples were rejected		
-			
- -			
Minor Anomo	olies:		
	No analytes required qualification l	pased on this data review.	
-	· · · · ·		
-			
Field IDs:	VI-10-B1		
-	VI-10-B1 VI-10-C1		
-			

1.0 Chain of Custody/Sample Condition

		Yes	No	NA
1.1	Do Chain-of-Custody forms list all samples analyzed?	X		
1.2	Are all Chain-of-Custody forms signed, indicating sample chain-of-custody was maintained?	X		
1.3	Do the Traffic Reports, chain-of-custody, and lab narrative indicate any problems with sample receipt,			
	condition of samples, analytical problems or special circumstances affecting the quality of the data?		X	

Note: No issues were noted in the laboratory case narrative or cooler receipt forms.

2.0 Holding Time/ Preservation (Code H)

		Yes	No	NA
2.1	2.1 Do sample preservation, collection and storage condition meet method requirement?			
	If sample preservation and/or temperature was inappropriate (i.e., $<2^{\circ}>6^{\circ}$ C, etc.), comment in report. If unpreserved or temperature is outside the range 0° (but not frozen) to 10° flag all positive results with a "J" and all non-detects "UJ". If temperature exceeds 10° , flag positive detections "J" and non-detects "R"			
2.2	Have any technical holding times, determined from sampling to date of analysis, been exceeded? If yes, $J(+)/UJ(-)$.		x	
	Matrix Preserved Holding Time			
	Air No 14 days			
2.3	Have any technical holding times been grossly (twice the holding time) exceeded? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$.		X	

Note: All holding time criteria were met.

3.0 GC/MS Instrument Performance Check (Code T)

		Yes	No	NA
3.1	Are GC/MS Tuning and Mass Calibration forms present for bromofluorobenzene (BFB)?			X
3.2	Have all samples been analyzed within twelve hours of the BFB tune? If no, flag R.			X
3.3	Have ion abundance criteria for BFB been met for each instrument used? If no, flag R.			X

Note:

4.0 Blanks (Method Blanks, Field Blanks and Trip Blanks)

(Code X - Field Blank Contamination, Code Y - Trip blank contamination, Code Z - Method blank contamination

		Yes	No	NA
4.1	Is a Method Blank Summary form present for each batch?	X		
4.2	Do any method blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
4.3	Do any field/trip rinse/equipment blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
	Action: Positive sample results <5X (or 10X for common volatile lab contaminants- methylene chloride, acetone, and 2-butanone) the blank concentration should be qualified "U". The result should be elevated the RL for estimate (laboratory "J" flagged) concentrations.			
4.4	If Level IV, review raw data and verify all detections for blanks were reported.			X

Note: All blank criteria were met.

5.0 GC/MS Initial Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
5.1	Are Initial Calibration summary forms present and complete for each instrument used?			X
5.2	Are CCCs linear applying either %RSD < 30% and all other compounds <15% or >0.990?			X
	If not, J(+)/ UJ(-). In extreme cases, the reviewer may flag non-detects "R".			
5.3	Do any SPCC compounds have an RRF less than specification or any other compounds < 0.05 (use 0.01			
	for poor responders like ketones or alcohols)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$.			X
5.4	Is the lowest standard at the same concentration, or lower, as the RL reported? If not, elevate RL.			X
5.5	If Level IV, recalculate a sample of RRFs and %RSDs to verify correct calculations are being made.			X

Note:

6.0 Continuing Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
6.1	Are Continuing Calibration Summary forms present and complete?			X
6.2	Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours?			X
6.3	Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4.			X
6.4	Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial ar continuing calibration RRF outside QC limits (%D < 20%)?			X
	If yes, a marginal increase in response >20% then $J(+)$ only; a decrease in response then $J(+)/UJ(-)$. For %D > 50%, flag R.			
6.5	Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$.	·		X
6.6	If Level IV, calculate a sample of RFs and %Ds from ave RF to verify correct calculations.			X

Note:

7.0 Surrogate Recovery (Code S)

						Yes	No	NA
7.1	Are all sampl	es listed on the a	ppropriate Surrogate Recovery Su	ımmary Form ?		X		
7.2	Are surrogate	recoveries within	n acceptance criteria specified in	the QAPP for all samples?		X		
7.3	If No in Section 7.2, were these sample(s) or method blank(s) reanalyzed?						X	
7.4 If No in Section 7.3, is any sample dilution factor greater than 10? (Surrogate recoveries may be diluted								
	out.)							X
	Note: If SMO	C recoveries do n	ot meet acceptance criteria in san	nples chosen for the MS/M	SD or diluted			
		> UCL	10% to LCL	< 10%				
	Positive	J	J	J				
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R				

Note: All surrogate recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

8.0 Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) or one MS with a Sample Duplicate (Recovery - Code M, RPD - Code D)

		Yes	No	NA
8.1	Is a Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate recovery form present?		X	
8.2	Are MS/MSDs analyzed at the required frequency of one matrix spike per ten samples and a duplicate per			
8.2	twenty for each matrix?			X
8.3	Are all MS/MSD %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria Specified in the QAPP?			X
	Using informed professional judgment, the data reviewer should use the MS and MSD results in			
	conjunction with other QC criteria and determine the need for qualification of the data for samples com			
	the same site/matrix. Recoveries <10% may require rejection. RPD failures may be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: MS/MSD samples were not submitted for analysis.

9.0 Laboratory Control Sample (LCS/LCSD) (Recovery - Code L, RPD - Code E)

		Yes	No	NA
9.1	Is an LCS recovery form present?	X		
9.2	Is an LCS analyzed at the required frequency of one per twenty field samples for each matrix?	X		
9.3	Are all LCS %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP?	X		
9.4	If Level IV, verify the % recoveries are calculated correctly.			X
	Action for specific compound outside the acceptance criteria: %R>UCL,			
	$J(+) \ only; < LCL, \ J(+)/UJ(-); < 30\% \ J(+)/R(-). \ \ RPD \ failures \ should \ be \ flagged \ "J" \ (+ \ only)$			

Note: All LCS recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

10.0 Internal Standards (Code I)

					Yes	No	NA
10.1 Are internal standard areas for every sample and blank within upper and lower QC limits?		X					
		Area>+100%	Area < -50%	Area < -10%		=	•
	Positive	J	J	J	Ī		
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R	Ī		
Note:	The method spec	cification is for the continuir	ng calibration to be compare	ed to the mid-point initial	Ī		
10.2	Are retention tim	nes of internal standards with	hin 30 seconds of the associ	ated calibration standard?	X		
	Action: The chr	omatogram must be examin	ed to determine if any false	positives or negatives exist. For			

Note: Internal standard area counts and retention times were within evaluation criteria.

11.0 TCL Identification (Code W)			No	NA
11.1	11.1 Is the relative retention time (RRT) of each reported compound within 0.06 RRT units of the standard			
	RRT in the continuing calibration?			X
11.2	Are the three ions of greatest intensity present in the standard mass spectrum also present in the samp			
	mass spectrum; and do sample and standard relative ion intensities agree within 30%?			X

Note:

12.0 TCL/TIC Quantitation and Reported Detection limits (Code K)		Yes	No	NA
12.1	Are RLs used consistent with those specified in the QAPP			X
12.2	Are these limits adjusted to reflect dilutions and/ or percent solids as required?			X
12.3	Are TIC ions greater than ten percent in the reference spectrum also present in the sample spectrum?			X
12.4	Are any positives reported that exceed the linear range of the instrument? If yes, than flag "J".			X
12.5	If Level IV, calculate a sample of positive results to verify correct calculation			X

Note:

13.0 Field Duplicate Samples (Code F)		Yes	No	NA
13.1	13.1 Were any field duplicates submitted for VOC analysis		X	
13.2	Were all RPD or absolute difference values within the control limits outlined in the QAPP?			X
	Action: No qualifying action is taken based on field duplicate results, however the data validator shou			
provide a qualitative assessment in the data validation report.				

Note: Field duplicate samples were not submitted for analysis.

14.0 Data Completeness

			Yes	No	NA
14.1	Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check Q	APP or use 95% for aqueous sample	X		
14.2	Number of samples:	4			
14.3	Number of target compounds in each analysis	60			
14.4	Number of results rejected and not reported	0			
	% Completeness = $100 \times ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)$				
	% Completeness	100			

Note:

DATA VALIDATION WORKSHEET VOLATILE ORGANIC ANALYSIS

Reviewer:	Steve Gragert	Project Name:	Sauget - Area 2 Air Sampling
Date:	11/14/2007	Project Number:	21561683.80012
Laboratory	Air Toxics	SDG No.:	0709647
		Review Level:	Level III
Major Anomo	olies:		
	No samples were rejected		
-			
Minor Anomo	olies:		
	Samples were qualified "U" due to	eld blank contamination.	
-			
-			
Field IDs:	VI-11-A		
	VI-11-A DUP		
	VI-13-A		
	VI-092807-FB		

1.0 Chain of Custody/Sample Condition

		1 es	110	NA
1.1	Do Chain-of-Custody forms list all samples analyzed?	X		
1.2	Are all Chain-of-Custody forms signed, indicating sample chain-of-custody was maintained?	X		
1.3	Do the Traffic Reports, chain-of-custody, and lab narrative indicate any problems with sample receipt,			
	condition of samples, analytical problems or special circumstances affecting the quality of the data?		X	

Note: The laboratory case narrative and cooler receipt form did not indicate any problems.

2.0 Holding Time/ Preservation (Code H)

		Yes	No	NA
2.1	Do sample preservation, collection and storage condition meet method requirement?	X		
	If sample preservation and/or temperature was inappropriate (i.e., $<2^{\circ}>6^{\circ}$ C, etc.), comment in report unpreserved or temperature is outside the range 0° (but not frozen) to 10° flag all positive results wing "J" and all non-detects "UJ". If temperature exceeds 10° , flag positive detections "J" and non-detects	th a		
2.2	2.2 Have any technical holding times, determined from sampling to date of analysis, been exceeded? If yes, $J(+)/UJ(-)$.		X	
	Matrix Preserved Holding Time			
	Air No 14 days			
2.3	Have any technical holding times been grossly (twice the holding time) exceeded? If yes, J(+)/R(-).		X	

Note: All holding time criteria were met.

		Yes	No	NA
3.1	Are GC/MS Tuning and Mass Calibration forms present for bromofluorobenzene (BFB)?			X
3.2	Have all samples been analyzed within twelve hours of the BFB tune? If no, flag R.			X
3.3	Have ion abundance criteria for BFB been met for each instrument used? If no, flag R.			X

Note:

4.0 Blanks (Method Blanks, Field Blanks and Trip Blanks)

(Code X - Field Blank Contamination, Code Y - Trip blank contamination, Code Z - Method blank contamination

		Yes	No	NA
4.1	Is a Method Blank Summary form present for each batch?	X		
4.2	Do any method blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
4.3	Do any field/trip rinse/equipment blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?	X		
	Action: Positive sample results <5X (or 10X for common volatile lab contaminants- methylene chloride, acetone, and 2-butanone) the blank concentration should be qualified "U". The result should be elevated			
	the RL for estimate (laboratory "J" flagged) concentrations.			
4.4	If Level IV, review raw data and verify all detections for blanks were reported.			X

Note: Field Blank VI-092807-FB had detections of the following analytes (in µg/m³): Ethanol (1.6), Acetone (11), 2-Butanone (6.4), Benzene
(0.61), Toluene (2.1), m,p-Xylene (1.2) and Oxygen (20%). Professional judgment was used to not qualify Oxygen due to the fact it is naturally occuring in air.

Analytes that required qualification due to field blank detections are located in the table below:

Field ID	Analyte(s)	Qualification	Code	Batch #	Justification
VI-11-A	Acetone	U	X	y100926	Field Blank contamination
VI-11-A	2-Butanone	U	X	y100926	Field Blank contamination
VI-11-A	m&p-Xylene	U	X	y100926	Field Blank contamination
VI-13-A	2-Butanone	U	X	y100926	Field Blank contamination
VI-13-A	Benzene	U	X	y100926	Field Blank contamination
VI-13-A	m&p-Xylene	U	X	y100926	Field Blank contamination

5.0 GC/MS Initial Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
5	Are Initial Calibration summary forms present and complete for each instrument used?			X
5	Are CCCs linear applying either %RSD < 30% and all other compounds <15% or >0.990?			X
	If not, J(+)/ UJ(-). In extreme cases, the reviewer may flag non-detects "R".			
5	Do any SPCC compounds have an RRF less than specification or any other compounds < 0.05 (use 0.05)	01		
	for poor responders like ketones or alcohols)? If yes, J(+)/R(-).			X
5	Is the lowest standard at the same concentration, or lower, as the RL reported? If not, elevate RL.			X
5	If Level IV, recalculate a sample of RRFs and %RSDs to verify correct calculations are being made.			X

6.0 Continuing Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
6.1	Are Continuing Calibration Summary forms present and complete?			X
6.2	Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours?			X
6.3	Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4.			X
6.4	Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial ar			
	continuing calibration RRF outside QC limits (%D < 20%)?			X
	If yes, a marginal increase in response >20% then J(+) only; a decrease in response then J(+)/UJ(-). For			
	%D > 50%, flag R.			
6.5	Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$.			X
6.6	If Level IV, calculate a sample of RFs and %Ds from ave RF to verify correct calculations.			X

Note:

7.0 Surrogate Recovery (Code S)

					Yes	No	NA
7.1	Are all sampl	es listed on the ap	opropriate Surrogate Recovery Su	ımmary Form ?	X		
7.2	Are surrogate	recoveries within	n acceptance criteria specified in	the QAPP for all samples?	X		
7.3	If No in Secti	on 7.2, were thes	e sample(s) or method blank(s) re	eanalyzed?			X
7.4	If No in Section 7.3, is any sample dilution factor greater than 10? (Surrogate recoveries may be diluted				nay be diluted		
	out.)						X
	Note: If SMO	C recoveries do no	ot meet acceptance criteria in sam	ples chosen for the MS/M	SD or diluted		
		> UCL	10% to LCL	< 10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			

Note: All surrogate recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

8.0 Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) or one MS with a Sample Duplicate (Recovery - Code M, RPD - Code D)

			Yes	No	NA
	8.1	Is a Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate recovery form present?		X	
	8.2	Are MS/MSDs analyzed at the required frequency of one matrix spike per ten samples and a duplicate per			
8.	0.2	twenty for each matrix?			X
	8.3	Are all MS/MSD %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria Specified in the QAPP?			X
		Using informed professional judgment, the data reviewer should use the MS and MSD results in			
		conjunction with other QC criteria and determine the need for qualification of the data for samples com			
		the same site/matrix. Recoveries <10% may require rejection. RPD failures may be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: MS/MSD samples were not submitted for analysis.

9.0 Laboratory Control Sample (LCS/LCSD) (Recovery - Code L, RPD - Code E)

		Yes	No	NA
9.1	Is an LCS recovery form present?	X		
9.2	Is an LCS analyzed at the required frequency of one per twenty field samples for each matrix?	X		
9.3	Are all LCS %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP?		X	
9.4	If Level IV, verify the % recoveries are calculated correctly.			X
	Action for specific compound outside the acceptance criteria: %R>UCL,			
	J(+) only; $<$ LCL, $J(+)/UJ(-)$; $<$ 30% $J(+)/R(-)$. RPD failures should be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: The LCS for TO-15 Full Scan had a LCS recovery (171%) outside of evaluation criteria (70-130%). All associated samples were non-detect. No qualification of data was required.

10.0 Internal Standards (Code I)

					Yes	No	NA
10.1	Are internal stan	are internal standard areas for every sample and blank within upper and lower QC limits?					
		Area $> +100\%$	Area < -50%	Area < -10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			
Note:	· ·	1 0	,	pecifications are met for a give e not to flag individual samples			
10.2	Are retention tim	nes of internal standards wit	hin 30 seconds of the associ	ated calibration standard?	X		
	shift of a large m	Are retention times of internal standards within 30 seconds of the associated calibration standard? Action: The chromatogram must be examined to determine if any false positives or negatives exist. F shift of a large magnitude, the reviewer may consider partial or total rejection of the data for non-detects i that sample/fraction.					

Note: Internal standard area counts and retention times were within evaluation criteria.

11.0 TCL Identification (Code W) 11.1 Is the relative retention time (RRT) of each reported compound within 0.06 RRT units of the standard RRT in the continuing calibration? 11.2 Are the three ions of greatest intensity present in the standard mass spectrum also present in the sample mass spectrum; and do sample and standard relative ion intensities agree within 30%? X

Note:

9/4/2008

12.0 TCL/TIC Quantitation and Reported Detection limits (Code K)			No	NA
12.1	Are RLs used consistent with those specified in the QAPP			X
12.2	Are these limits adjusted to reflect dilutions and/ or percent solids as required?			X
12.3	Are TIC ions greater than ten percent in the reference spectrum also present in the sample spectrum?			X
12.4	Are any positives reported that exceed the linear range of the instrument? If yes, than flag "J".			X
12.5	If Level IV, calculate a sample of positive results to verify correct calculation			X

Note:

13.0 Field Duplicate Samples (Code F)			No	NA
13.1	Were any field duplicates submitted for VOC analysis	X		
13.2	Were all RPD or absolute difference values within the control limits outlined in the QAPP?	X		
	Action: No qualifying action is taken based on field duplicate results, however the data validator shou			
	provide a qualitative assessment in the data validation report.			

Note: Sample VI-11-A DUP was a field duplicate of sample VI-11-A

14.0 Data Completeness

			Yes	No	NA
14.1	Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check (APP or use 95% for aqueous sample	X		
14.2	Number of samples:	4			
14.3	Number of target compounds in each analysis	60			
14.4	Number of results rejected and not reported	0			
	% Completeness = $100 \times ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)$				
	% Completeness	100			
Note:					

I:\CHEM\Sauget_Solutia\Level III\SDG SAS052.xls 5of5

Reviewer	: Steve Gragert	Project Name:	Sauget - Area 2 Air Sampling
Date:	11/14/2007	Project Number:	21561683.80012
Laboratory	Air Toxics	SDG No.:	0709608
		Review Level:	Level III
Major Anom	nolies:		
	No samples were rejected		
Minor Anom	nolies:		
	No analytes required qualification	n based on this data review.	
Field IDs:	VI-10-D		
		-	

1.0 Chain of Custody/Sample Condition

		Yes	No	NA
1.1	Do Chain-of-Custody forms list all samples analyzed?	X		
1.2	Are all Chain-of-Custody forms signed, indicating sample chain-of-custody was maintained?	X		
1.3	Do the Traffic Reports, chain-of-custody, and lab narrative indicate any problems with sample receipt,			
	condition of samples, analytical problems or special circumstances affecting the quality of the data?		X	

Note: No issues were noted in the laboratory case narrative or cooler receipt forms.

2.0 Holding Time/ Preservation (Code H)

			Yes	No	NA
2.1	Do sample preservation, collection and storage condition meet method requirement?		X		
	If sample preservation and/or temperature was inappropriate (i.e., <2° >6°C, etc.), comunpreserved or temperature is outside the range 0° (but not frozen) to 10° flag all posit "J" and all non-detects "UJ". If temperature exceeds 10°, flag positive detections "J" are				
2.2	Have any technical holding times, determined from sampling to date of analysis, been of $J(+)/UJ(-)$.		x		
	Matrix Preserved Holding Time				
	Air No 14 days				
2.3	Have any technical holding times been grossly (twice the holding time) exceeded? If y	es, J(+)/R(-).		X	

Note: All holding time criteria were met.

		Yes	No	NA
3.1	Are GC/MS Tuning and Mass Calibration forms present for bromofluorobenzene (BFB)?			X
3.2	Have all samples been analyzed within twelve hours of the BFB tune? If no, flag R.			X
3.3	Have ion abundance criteria for BFB been met for each instrument used? If no, flag R.			X

Note:

4.0 Blanks (Method Blanks, Field Blanks and Trip Blanks)

(Code X - Field Blank Contamination, Code Y - Trip blank contamination, Code Z - Method blank contamination

		Yes	No	NA
4.1	Is a Method Blank Summary form present for each batch?	X		
4.2	Do any method blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
4.3	Do any field/trip rinse/equipment blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
	Action: Positive sample results <5X (or 10X for common volatile lab contaminants- methylene chloride, acetone, and 2-butanone) the blank concentration should be qualified "U". The result should be elevated the RL for estimate (laboratory "J" flagged) concentrations.			
4.4	If Level IV, review raw data and verify all detections for blanks were reported.			X

Note: All blank criteria were met.

5.0 GC/MS Initial Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
5.1	Are Initial Calibration summary forms present and complete for each instrument used?			X
5.2	Are CCCs linear applying either %RSD < 30% and all other compounds <15% or >0.990?			X
	If not, J(+)/ UJ(-). In extreme cases, the reviewer may flag non-detects "R".			
5.3	Do any SPCC compounds have an RRF less than specification or any other compounds < 0.05 (use 0.01			
	for poor responders like ketones or alcohols)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$.			X
5.4	Is the lowest standard at the same concentration, or lower, as the RL reported? If not, elevate RL.			X
5.5	If Level IV, recalculate a sample of RRFs and %RSDs to verify correct calculations are being made.			X

Note:

6.0 Continuing Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
6.1	Are Continuing Calibration Summary forms present and complete?			X
6.2	Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours?			X
6.3	Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4.			X
6.4	Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial ar			
	continuing calibration RRF outside QC limits (%D < 20%)?			X
	If yes, a marginal increase in response $>20\%$ then $J(+)$ only; a decrease in response then $J(+)/UJ(-)$. For			
	%D > 50%, flag R.			
6.5	Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$.			X
6.6	If Level IV, calculate a sample of RFs and %Ds from ave RF to verify correct calculations.			X

7.0 Surrogate Recovery (Code S)

					Yes	No	NA
7.1	Are all sampl	es listed on the a	ppropriate Surrogate Recovery Su	ımmary Form ?	X		
7.2	Are surrogate	recoveries withi	in acceptance criteria specified in	the QAPP for all samples?	X		
7.3	If No in Secti	on 7.2, were the	se sample(s) or method blank(s) re	eanalyzed?			X
7.4	If No in Section 7.3, is any sample dilution factor greater than 10? (Surrogate recoveries may be diluted				be diluted		
	out.)						X
	Note: If SMO	C recoveries do n	ot meet acceptance criteria in san	ples chosen for the MS/MSD	or diluted		
		> UCL	10% to LCL	< 10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			

Note: All surrogate recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

8.0 Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) or one MS with a Sample Duplicate (Recovery - Code M, RPD - Code D)

		Yes	No	NA
8.1	Is a Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate recovery form present?		X	
8.2	Are MS/MSDs analyzed at the required frequency of one matrix spike per ten samples and a duplicate per	•		
8.2	twenty for each matrix?			X
8.3	Are all MS/MSD %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria Specified in the QAPP?			X
	Using informed professional judgment, the data reviewer should use the MS and MSD results in			
	conjunction with other QC criteria and determine the need for qualification of the data for samples com			
	the same site/matrix. Recoveries <10% may require rejection. RPD failures may be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: MS/MSD samples were not submitted for analysis.

9.0 Laboratory Control Sample (LCS/LCSD) (Recovery - Code L, RPD - Code E)

		Yes	No	NA
9.1	Is an LCS recovery form present?	X		
9.2	Is an LCS analyzed at the required frequency of one per twenty field samples for each matrix?	X		
9.3	Are all LCS %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP?	X		
9.4	If Level IV, verify the % recoveries are calculated correctly.			X
	Action for specific compound outside the acceptance criteria: %R>UCL,			
	J(+) only; $<$ LCL, $J(+)/UJ(-)$; $<$ 30% $J(+)/R(-)$. RPD failures should be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: All LCS recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

10.0 Internal Standards (Code I)

					Yes	No	NA
10.1	Are internal stand	lard areas for every sample	and blank within upper and	lower QC limits?	X		
		Area $> +100\%$	Area < -50%	Area < -10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			
Note:	Note: calibration, not sample to continuing calibration. Thus, if all other QC specifications are met for a given sample, using informed professional judgment, the reviewer may choose not to flag individual samples in this case.						
10.2					X		
	shift of a large ma	Are retention times of internal standards within 30 seconds of the associated calibration standard? Action: The chromatogram must be examined to determine if any false positives or negatives exist. F hift of a large magnitude, the reviewer may consider partial or total rejection of the data for non-detects in that sample/fraction.					

Note: Internal standard area counts and retention times were within evaluation criteria.

11.0 TCL Identification (Code W)			Yes	No	NA
	11.1	Is the relative retention time (RRT) of each reported compound within 0.06 RRT units of the standard			
		RRT in the continuing calibration?			X
	11.2	Are the three ions of greatest intensity present in the standard mass spectrum also present in the sample			
		mass spectrum; and do sample and standard relative ion intensities agree within 30%?			X

12.0 TCL/TIC Quantitation and Reported Detection limits (Code K) Yes No NA Are RLs used consistent with those specified in the QAPP 12.1 X 12.2 Are these limits adjusted to reflect dilutions and/ or percent solids as required? X Are TIC ions greater than ten percent in the reference spectrum also present in the sample spectrum? 12.3 X 12.4 Are any positives reported that exceed the linear range of the instrument? If yes, than flag "J". X If Level IV, calculate a sample of positive results to verify correct calculation 12.5 \mathbf{x}

13.0 Field Duplicate Samples (Code F)		Yes	No	NA
13.1	Were any field duplicates submitted for VOC analysis		X	
13.2	Were all RPD or absolute difference values within the control limits outlined in the QAPP?			X
	Action: No qualifying action is taken based on field duplicate results, however the data validator shou			
	provide a qualitative assessment in the data validation report.			
Note:	Field duplicate samples were not submitted for analysis.			

14.0 Data Completeness

Note:

Note:

			Yes	No	NA
14.1	Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check QAPP or use 95% for aqueous sample)				
14.2	Number of samples:	1			
14.3	Number of target compounds in each analysis	60			
14.4	Number of results rejected and not reported	0			
	% Completeness = $100 \times ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)$				
	% Completeness	100			
Note:				•	

I:\CHEM\Sauget_Solutia\Level III\SDG SAS052.xls 4of4 9/4/2008

Reviewer:	Steve Gragert	Project Name:	Sauget - Area 2 Air Sampling
Date:	11/14/2007	Project Number:	21561683.80012
Laboratory	Air Toxics	SDG No.:	0709576
		Review Level:	Level III
Major Anom	olies:		
	No samples were rejected		
Minor Anom	olies:		
	No analytes required qualification l	ased on this data review.	
Field IDs:	VI-10-A		
	VI-6-A		
	VI-12-A		

1.0 Chain of Custody/Sample Condition

			Yes	No	NA
	1.1	Do Chain-of-Custody forms list all samples analyzed?	X		
	1.2	Are all Chain-of-Custody forms signed, indicating sample chain-of-custody was maintained?	X		
$\ \ $	1.3	Do the Traffic Reports, chain-of-custody, and lab narrative indicate any problems with sample receipt,			
L		condition of samples, analytical problems or special circumstances affecting the quality of the data?		X	

Note: The laboratory case narrative and cooler receipt form did not indicate any problems.

2.0 Holding Time/ Preservation (Code H)

		Yes	No	NA
2.1	Do sample preservation, collection and storage condition meet method requirement?	X		
	If sample preservation and/or temperature was inappropriate (i.e., $<2^{\circ}>6^{\circ}$ C, etc.), comment in report unpreserved or temperature is outside the range 0° (but not frozen) to 10° flag all positive results with "J" and all non-detects "UJ". If temperature exceeds 10° , flag positive detections "J" and non-detects	th a		
2.2	Have any technical holding times, determined from sampling to date of analysis, been exceeded? If $J(+)/UJ(-)$.	yes,	x	
	Matrix Preserved Holding Time			
	Air No 14 days			
2.3	Have any technical holding times been grossly (twice the holding time) exceeded? If yes, J(+)/R(-).			

Note: All holding time criteria were met.

			Yes	No	NA
3.	1 Are GC/MS	Cuning and Mass Calibration forms present for bromofluorobenzene (BFB)?			X
3.	2 Have all sam	oles been analyzed within twelve hours of the BFB tune? If no, flag R.			X
3.	Have ion abu	ndance criteria for BFB been met for each instrument used? If no, flag R.			X

Note:

4.0 Blanks (Method Blanks, Field Blanks and Trip Blanks)

(Code X - Field Blank Contamination, Code Y - Trip blank contamination, Code Z - Method blank contamination

		Yes	No	NA
4.1	Is a Method Blank Summary form present for each batch?	X		
4.2	Do any method blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
4.3	Do any field/trip rinse/equipment blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?			X
	Action: Positive sample results <5X (or 10X for common volatile lab contaminants- methylene chloride, acetone, and 2-butanone) the blank concentration should be qualified "U". The result should be elevated the RL for estimate (laboratory "J" flagged) concentrations.			
4.4	If Level IV, review raw data and verify all detections for blanks were reported.			X

Note: All blank criteria were met.

5.0 GC/MS Initial Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
5.1	Are Initial Calibration summary forms present and complete for each instrument used?			X
5.2	Are CCCs linear applying either %RSD < 30% and all other compounds <15% or >0.990?			X
	If not, J(+)/ UJ(-). In extreme cases, the reviewer may flag non-detects "R".			
5.3	Do any SPCC compounds have an RRF less than specification or any other compounds < 0.05 (use 0.01			
	for poor responders like ketones or alcohols)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$.			X
5.4	Is the lowest standard at the same concentration, or lower, as the RL reported? If not, elevate RL.			X
5.5	If Level IV, recalculate a sample of RRFs and %RSDs to verify correct calculations are being made.			X

Note:

6.0 Continuing Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
6.	Are Continuing Calibration Summary forms present and complete?			X
6.	Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours?			X
6.	Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4.			X
6.	Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial ar continuing calibration RRF outside QC limits (%D < 20%)?			x
	If yes, a marginal increase in response >20% then $J(+)$ only; a decrease in response then $J(+)/UJ(-)$. For %D > 50%, flag R.			
6.	Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$.			X
6.	If Level IV, calculate a sample of RFs and %Ds from ave RF to verify correct calculations.	•	•	X

7.0 Surrogate Recovery (Code S)

					Yes	No	NA
7.1	Are all sampl	es listed on the a	ppropriate Surrogate Recovery Su	ımmary Form ?	X		
7.2	Are surrogate	recoveries withi	in acceptance criteria specified in	the QAPP for all samples?	X		
7.3	If No in Secti	on 7.2, were the	se sample(s) or method blank(s) re	eanalyzed?			X
7.4	7.4 If No in Section 7.3, is any sample dilution factor greater than 10? (Surrogate recoveries may be diluted				be diluted		
	out.)						X
	Note: If SMO	C recoveries do n	ot meet acceptance criteria in san	ples chosen for the MS/MSD	or diluted		
		> UCL	10% to LCL	< 10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			

Note: All surrogate recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

8.0 Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) or one MS with a Sample Duplicate (Recovery - Code M, RPD - Code D)

		Yes	No	NA
8.1	Is a Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate recovery form present?		X	
8.2	Are MS/MSDs analyzed at the required frequency of one matrix spike per ten samples and a duplicate per	•		
0.2	twenty for each matrix?			X
8.3	Are all MS/MSD %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria Specified in the QAPP?			X
	Using informed professional judgment, the data reviewer should use the MS and MSD results in			
	conjunction with other QC criteria and determine the need for qualification of the data for samples com			
	the same site/matrix. Recoveries <10% may require rejection. RPD failures may be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: MS/MSD samples were not submitted for analysis.

9.0 Laboratory Control Sample (LCS/LCSD) (Recovery - Code L, RPD - Code E)

		Yes	No	NA
9.1	Is an LCS recovery form present?	X		
9.2	Is an LCS analyzed at the required frequency of one per twenty field samples for each matrix?	X		
9.3	Are all LCS %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP?	X		
9.4	If Level IV, verify the % recoveries are calculated correctly.			X
	Action for specific compound outside the acceptance criteria: %R>UCL,			
	J(+) only; $<$ LCL, $J(+)/UJ(-)$; $<$ 30% $J(+)/R(-)$. RPD failures should be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: All LCS recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

10.0 Internal Standards (Code I)

					Yes	No	NA
10.1	Are internal stand	dard areas for every sample	and blank within upper and	lower QC limits?	X		
		Area>+100%	Area < -50%	Area < -10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			
Note:	· ·	1		pecifications are met for a give e not to flag individual samples			
10.2			hin 30 seconds of the associ		X		
	Action: The chromatogram must be examined to determine if any false positives or negatives exist. F shift of a large magnitude, the reviewer may consider partial or total rejection of the data for non-detect that sample/fraction.						

Note: Internal standard area counts and retention times were within evaluation criteria.

11.0 TCL Identification (Code W)				No	NA
1	11.1	Is the relative retention time (RRT) of each reported compound within 0.06 RRT units of the standard			
		RRT in the continuing calibration?			X
1	11.2	Are the three ions of greatest intensity present in the standard mass spectrum also present in the sample			
		mass spectrum; and do sample and standard relative ion intensities agree within 30%?			X

Note:

12.0 TCL/TIC Quantitation and Reported Detection limits (Code K)				NA
12.1	Are RLs used consistent with those specified in the QAPP			X
12.2	Are these limits adjusted to reflect dilutions and/ or percent solids as required?			X
12.3	Are TIC ions greater than ten percent in the reference spectrum also present in the sample spectrum?			X
12.4	Are any positives reported that exceed the linear range of the instrument? If yes, than flag "J".			X
12.5	If Level IV, calculate a sample of positive results to verify correct calculation			X

Note:

13.	13.0 Field Duplicate Samples (Code F)				NA
	13.1 Were any field duplicates submitted for VOC analysis				
	13.2	Were all RPD or absolute difference values within the control limits outlined in the QAPP?			X
		Action: No qualifying action is taken based on field duplicate results, however the data validator shou			
		provide a qualitative assessment in the data validation report.			

Note: Field duplicate samples were not submitted for analysis.

14.0 Data Completeness

			Yes	No	NA
14.1 Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check QAPP or use 95% for aqueous sample					
14.2	Number of samples:	3		•	,
14.3	Number of target compounds in each analysis 60				
14.4	Number of results rejected and not reported	0			
	% Completeness = $100 \times ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)$				
	% Completeness	100			

Reviewer	: Steve Gragert	Project Name:	Sauget - Area 2 Air Sampling
Date:	11/15/2007	Project Number:	21561683.80012
Laboratory	Air Toxics	SDG No.:	0709576
		Review Level:	Level IV
Major Anom	nolies:		_
	No samples were rejected		
Minor Anom	nolies:		
	Samples were qualified "J/UJ" due	to Initial and Continuing Calibration %RSDs and %Ds outside of evaluation criteria.	
		-	
Field IDs:	VI-10-A		
	VI-6-A		
	VI-12-A		

1.0 Chain of Custody/Sample Condition

			Yes	No	NA
	1.1	Do Chain-of-Custody forms list all samples analyzed?	X		
	1.2	Are all Chain-of-Custody forms signed, indicating sample chain-of-custody was maintained?	X		
$\ \ $	1.3	Do the Traffic Reports, chain-of-custody, and lab narrative indicate any problems with sample receipt,			
L		condition of samples, analytical problems or special circumstances affecting the quality of the data?		X	

Note: The laboratory case narrative and cooler receipt form did not indicate any problems.

2.0 Holding Time/ Preservation (Code H)

		Yes	No	NA
2.1	Do sample preservation, collection and storage condition meet method requirement?	X		
	If sample preservation and/or temperature was inappropriate (i.e., <2° >6°C, etc.), comment in reunpreserved or temperature is outside the range 0° (but not frozen) to 10° flag all positive result "J" and all non-detects "UJ". If temperature exceeds 10°, flag positive detections "J" and non-detects "UJ".	s with a		
2.2	Have any technical holding times, determined from sampling to date of analysis, been exceeded $J(+)/UJ(-)$.	If yes,	x	
	Matrix Preserved Holding Time			
	Air No 14 days			
2.3	Have any technical holding times been grossly (twice the holding time) exceeded? If yes, J(+)/R	₹(-).	X	

Note: All holding time criteria were met.

			Yes	No	NA
I	3.1	Are GC/MS Tuning and Mass Calibration forms present for bromofluorobenzene (BFB)?	X		
	3.2	Have all samples been analyzed within twelve hours of the BFB tune? If no, flag R.	X		
	3.3	Have ion abundance criteria for BFB been met for each instrument used? If no, flag R.	X		

Note: All instrument performance check criteria were met.

4.0 Blanks (Method Blanks, Field Blanks and Trip Blanks)

(Code X - Field Blank Contamination, Code Y - Trip blank contamination, Code Z - Method blank contamination

			Yes	No	NA
	4.1	Is a Method Blank Summary form present for each batch?	X		
	4.2	Do any method blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
	4.3	Do any field/trip rinse/equipment blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?			X
Action: Positive sample results <5X (or 10X for common acetone, and 2-butanone) the blank concentration should		Action: Positive sample results <5X (or 10X for common volatile lab contaminants- methylene chloride, acetone, and 2-butanone) the blank concentration should be qualified "U". The result should be elevated the RL for estimate (laboratory "J" flagged) concentrations.			
	4.4	If Level IV, review raw data and verify all detections for blanks were reported.	X		

Note: All blank criteria were met.

5.0 GC/MS Initial Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
5.1	Are Initial Calibration summary forms present and complete for each instrument used?	X		
5.2	Are CCCs linear applying either %RSD < 30% and all other compounds <30% or >0.990?		X	
	If not, J(+)/ UJ(-). In extreme cases, the reviewer may flag non-detects "R".			
5.3	Do any SPCC compounds have an RRF less than specification or any other compounds < 0.05 (use 0.01			
	for poor responders like ketones or alcohols)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$.		X	
5.4	Is the lowest standard at the same concentration, or lower, as the RL reported? If not, elevate RL.	X		
5.5	If Level IV, recalculate a sample of RRFs and %RSDs to verify correct calculations are being made.	X		

Note: For TO-15 Full Scan, all analytes had a %RSD < 30%, with the exception of 1,2-Dichlorobenzene (31%) in data package 0709576A,

alpha-Chlorotoluene and MTBE (38%) in data package 0709576D, Qualifications based on ICAL %RSD are located in the table below:

Field ID	Analyte(s)	Qualification	Code	Batch #	Justification
VI-12-A	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	J	C	t1410921b	ICAL %RSD >30%
VI-10-A	alpha-Chlorotoluene	UJ	C	t14q928b	ICAL %RSD >30%
VI-10-A	Methyl tert-butyl ether	UJ	C	t14q928b	ICAL %RSD >30%
VI-6-A	alpha-Chlorotoluene	UJ	C	t14q928b	ICAL %RSD >30%
VI-6-A	Methyl tert-butyl ether	UJ	С	t14q928b	ICAL %RSD >30%

6.0 Continuing Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
6.1	Are Continuing Calibration Summary forms present and complete?	X		
6.2	Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours?	X		
6.3	Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4.	X		
6.4	Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial ar			
	continuing calibration RRF outside QC limits (%D <30%)?	X		
	If yes, a marginal increase in response $>30\%$ then $J(+)$ only; a decrease in response then $J(+)/UJ(-)$. For			
	%D > 50%, flag R.			
6.5	Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$.		X	
6.6	If Level IV, calculate a sample of RFs and %Ds from ave RF to verify correct calculations.	X		

Note: For TO-15 Full Scan, all analytes had a %D < 30%, with the exception of Ethanol (40%) and Methyl tert-butyl ether (33%) for data package 0709576A. In data package 0709576D, 2-Butanone (33%) and alpha-Chlorotoluene (36%) had %D > 30%. Qualifications based on CCAL %D are located in the table below. The compound alpha-chlorotoluene was previously qualified due to initial calibration in samples VI-10-A and VI-6-A, no additional qualification of data was required.

Field ID	Analyte(s)	Qualification	Code	Batch #	Justification
VI-12-A	Ethanol	UJ	С	t14l0921b	CCAL %D >30%
VI-12-A	Methyl tert-butyl ether	UJ	С	t1410921b	CCAL %D >30%
VI-10-A	2-Butanone	J	С	t14q928b	CCAL %D >30%
VI-6-A	2-Butanone	UJ	С	t14q928b	CCAL %D >30%

7.0 Surrogate Recovery (Code S)

						Yes	No	NA
7.1	Are all sampl	les listed on the ap	propriate Surrogate Recovery S	ımmary Form ?		X		
7.2	Are surrogate	e recoveries within	acceptance criteria specified in	the QAPP for all samples?	•	X		
7.3	If No in Secti	ion 7.2, were these	e sample(s) or method blank(s) r	eanalyzed?				X
7.4	If No in Sectiout.)	No in Section 7.3, is any sample dilution factor greater than 10? (Surrogate recoveries may be diluted t.)			may be diluted			X
	Note: If SMC recoveries do not meet acceptance criteria in samples chosen for the MS/MSD or diluted				SD or diluted			
		> UCL	10% to LCL	< 10%				
	Positive	J	J	J				
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R				

Note: All surrogate recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

8.0 Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) or one MS with a Sample Duplicate (Recovery - Code M, RPD - Code D)

		Yes	No	NA
8.1	Is a Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate recovery form present?			X
8.2	Are MS/MSDs analyzed at the required frequency of one matrix spike per ten samples and a duplicate per			
0.2	twenty for each matrix?			X
8.3	Are all MS/MSD %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria Specified in the QAPP?			X
	Using informed professional judgment, the data reviewer should use the MS and MSD results in			
	conjunction with other QC criteria and determine the need for qualification of the data for samples om			
	the same site/matrix. Recoveries <10% may require rejection. RPD failures may be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: MS/MSD samples were not submitted for analysis.

9.0 Laboratory Control Sample (LCS/LCSD) (Recovery - Code L, RPD - Code E)

		Yes	No	NA
9.1	Is an LCS recovery form present?	X		
9.2	Is an LCS analyzed at the required frequency of one per twenty field samples for each matrix?	X		
9.3	Are all LCS %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP?	X		
9.4	If Level IV, verify the % recoveries are calculated correctly.	X		
	Action for specific compound outside the acceptance criteria: %R>UCL,			
J(+) only; $<$ LCL, $J(+)/UJ(-)$; $<$ 30% $J(+)/R(-)$. RPD failures should be flagged "J" $(+$ only)				

Note: All LCS recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

10.0 Internal Standards (Code I)

					Yes	No	NA
10.1	Are internal stan	dard areas for every sample	and blank within upper and	lower QC limits?	X		
		Area $> +100\%$	Area < -50%	Area < -10%		•	•
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			
Note:	·	calibration, not sample to continuing calibration. Thus, if all other QC specifications are met for a given sample, using informed professional judgment, the reviewer may choose not to flag individual samples in this case.					
10.2			hin 30 seconds of the associ		X		
	Action: The chromatogram must be examined to determine if any false positives or negatives exist. F					•	•
	shift of a large magnitude, the reviewer may consider partial or total rejection of the data for non-detects i				s in		
	that sample/fract	ion.					

Note: Internal standard area counts and retention times were within evaluation criteria.

11.0 TCL	Identification (Code W)	Yes	No	NA
11.1	Is the relative retention time (RRT) of each reported compound within 0.06 RRT units of the standard			
	RRT in the continuing calibration?	X		
11.2	Are the three ions of greatest intensity present in the standard mass spectrum also present in the sample			
	mass spectrum; and do sample and standard relative ion intensities agree within 30%?	X		1

Note: All criteria were met.

All criteria were met.

Note:

12.0 TCL/T	IC Quantitation and Reported Detection limits (Code K)	Yes	No	NA
12.1	Are RLs used consistent with those specified in the QAPP	X		
12.2	Are these limits adjusted to reflect dilutions and/ or percent solids as required?	X		
12.3	Are TIC ions greater than ten percent in the reference spectrum also present in the sample spectrum?			X
12.4	Are any positives reported that exceed the linear range of the instrument? If yes, than flag "J".		X	
12.5	If Level IV, calculate a sample of positive results to verify correct calculation	X		

I:\CHEM\Sauget_Solutia\Level III\SDG SAS052.xls 4of5

13.0 Field I	13.0 Field Duplicate Samples (Code F)			NA
13.1	Were any field duplicates submitted for VOC analysis		X	
13.2	Were all RPD or absolute difference values within the control limits outlined in the QAPP?			X
	Action: No qualifying action is taken based on field duplicate results, however the data validator shou			
	provide a qualitative assessment in the data validation report.			
Note:	Field duplicate samples were not submitted for analysis.			·

14.0 Data Completeness

			Yes	No	NA
14.1	Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check QAPP or use 95% for aqueous sample		X		
14.2	Number of samples:	3			
14.3	Number of target compounds in each analysis 60				
14.4	Number of results rejected and not reported 0				
	% Completeness = $100 \times ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)$				
	% Completeness	100			

Reviewer:	Steve Gragert	Project Name:	Sauget - Area 2 Air Sampling
Date:	11/14/2007	Project Number:	21561683.80012
Laboratory	Air Toxics	SDG No.:	0709557
		Review Level:	Level III
Major Anom	olies:	-	
	No samples were rejected		
Minor Anom		field blank contamination. Samples were also qualified " ${f J}$ " due to high surrogate recovery.	
Field IDs:	VI-5-A VI-5-B VI-5-C VI-092507-FB		

1.0 Chain of Custody/Sample Condition

		Yes	No	NA
1.1	Do Chain-of-Custody forms list all samples analyzed?	X		
1.2	Are all Chain-of-Custody forms signed, indicating sample chain-of-custody was maintained?	X		
1.3	Do the Traffic Reports, chain-of-custody, and lab narrative indicate any problems with sample receipt,			
	condition of samples, analytical problems or special circumstances affecting the quality of the data?		X	

Note:

The laboratory case narrative inidacted surrogate recovery was outside evaluation criteria for TO-15 full scan and TO-15 SIM. No other issues were noted in the case narrative or cooler receipt forms.

2.0 Holding Time/ Preservation (Code H)

		Yes	No	NA
2.1	Do sample preservation, collection and storage condition meet method requirement?	X		
	If sample preservation and/or temperature was inappropriate (i.e., $<2^{\circ}>6^{\circ}$ C, etc.), comment in report. If unpreserved or temperature is outside the range 0° (but not frozen) to 10° flag all positive results with a "J" and all non-detects "UJ". If temperature exceeds 10° , flag positive detections "J" and non-detects "R'			
2.2	Have any technical holding times, determined from sampling to date of analysis, been exceeded? If yes, $J(+)/UJ(-)$.		x	
	Matrix Preserved Holding Time			
	Air No 14 days			
2.3	Have any technical holding times been grossly (twice the holding time) exceeded? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$.		X	

Note: All holding time criteria were met.

		Yes	No	NA
3.1	Are GC/MS Tuning and Mass Calibration forms present for bromofluorobenzene (BFB)?			X
3.2	Have all samples been analyzed within twelve hours of the BFB tune? If no, flag R.			X
3.3	Have ion abundance criteria for BFB been met for each instrument used? If no, flag R.			X

Note:

4.0 Blanks (Method Blanks, Field Blanks and Trip Blanks)

(Code X - Field Blank Contamination, Code Y - Trip blank contamination, Code Z - Method blank contamination

		Yes	No	NA
4.1	Is a Method Blank Summary form present for each batch?	X		
4.2	Do any method blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
4.3	Do any field/trip rinse/equipment blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
	Action: Positive sample results <5X (or 10X for common volatile lab contaminants- methylene chloride,			
	acetone, and 2-butanone) the blank concentration should be qualified "U". The result should be elevated			
	the RL for estimate (laboratory "J" flagged) concentrations.			
4.4	If Level IV, review raw data and verify all detections for blanks were reported.			X

Note: Field Blank VI-092507-FB had detections of the following analytes (in μg/m³): Ethanol (1.8), Acetone (13), 2-Butanone (10), Benzene (0.58), Toluene (2.0), m,p-Xylene (1.4), o-Xylene (0.70), 4-Ethyltoluene (0.98), and 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene (1.5).

Analytes that required qualification due to Field Blank detections are located in the table below:

Field ID	Analyte(s)	Qualification	Code	Batch #	Justification
VI-5-A	m&p-Xylene	U	X	t14l0921b	Field Blank contamination
VI-5-A	4-Ethyltoluene	U	X	t1410921b	Field Blank contamination
VI-5-B	2-Butanone	U	X	t1410921b	Field Blank contamination
VI-5-C	2-Butanone	U	X	t14l0921b	Field Blank contamination
VI-5-C	m&p-Xylene	U	X	t1410921b	Field Blank contamination
VI-5-C	o-Xylene	U	X	t1410921b	Field Blank contamination
VI-5-C	4-Ethyltoluene	U	X	t14l0921b	Field Blank contamination
VI-5-C	1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	U	X	t1410921b	Field Blank contamination

5.0 GC/MS Initial Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
5.1	Are Initial Calibration summary forms present and complete for each instrument used?			X
5.2	Are CCCs linear applying either %RSD < 30% and all other compounds <15% or >0.990?			X
	If not, J(+)/ UJ(-). In extreme cases, the reviewer may flag non-detects "R".			
5.3	Do any SPCC compounds have an RRF less than specification or any other compounds < 0.05 (use 0.01			
	for poor responders like ketones or alcohols)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$.			X
5.4	Is the lowest standard at the same concentration, or lower, as the RL reported? If not, elevate RL.			X
5.5	If Level IV, recalculate a sample of RRFs and %RSDs to verify correct calculations are being made.			X

6.0 Continuing Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
6.1	Are Continuing Calibration Summary forms present and complete?			X
6.2	Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours?			X
6.3	Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4.			X
6.4	Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial ar			
	continuing calibration RRF outside QC limits (%D < 20%)?			X
	If yes, a marginal increase in response $>20\%$ then $J(+)$ only; a decrease in response then $J(+)/UJ(-)$. For			
	%D > 50%, flag R.			
6.5	Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$.			X
6.6	If Level IV, calculate a sample of RFs and %Ds from ave RF to verify correct calculations.			X

Note:

7.0 Surrogate Recovery (Code S)

						Yes	No	NA
7.1	Are all sampl	es listed on the a	ppropriate Surrogate Recovery Su	ımmary Form ?		X		
7.2	Are surrogate	recoveries withi	n acceptance criteria specified in	the QAPP for all samples?			X	
7.3	If No in Secti	on 7.2, were thes	e sample(s) or method blank(s) re	eanalyzed?			X	
7.4	If No in Secti	on 7.3, is any sar	nple dilution factor greater than 1	0? (Surrogate recoveries ma	y be diluted			
	out.)						X	
	Note: If SMO	C recoveries do n	ot meet acceptance criteria in san	ples chosen for the MS/MSI	O or diluted			
	samples, then	no reanalysis is	required.					
		> UCL	10% to LCL	< 10%				
	Positive	J	J	J				
	Non-detect	None	ÚJ	R				

Note: In sample VI-5-C, the surrogate 1,2-Dichloroethane-d4 had a recovery (193%) outside of evaluation criteria (70-130%) in both full scan and SIM.

Analytes that required qualification due to surrogate recovery are located in the table below:

)		
Field ID	Analyte(s)	Qualification	Code	Batch #	Justification
VI-5-C	All TO-15 full scan detections	J	S	y100315	High surrogate recovery
VI-5-C	All TO-15 SIM detections	J	S	a100410	High surrogate recovery

8.0 Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) or one MS with a Sample Duplicate (Recovery - Code M, RPD - Code D)

		Yes	No	NA
8.1	Is a Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate recovery form present?		X	
8.2	Are MS/MSDs analyzed at the required frequency of one matrix spike per ten samples and a duplicate per			
	twenty for each matrix?			X
8.3	Are all MS/MSD %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria Specified in the QAPP?			X
	Using informed professional judgment, the data reviewer should use the MS and MSD results in			
	conjunction with other QC criteria and determine the need for qualification of the data for samples com			
	the same site/matrix. Recoveries <10% may require rejection. RPD failures may be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: MS/MSD samples were not submitted for analysis.

9.0 Laboratory Control Sample (LCS/LCSD) (Recovery - Code L, RPD - Code E)

			Yes	No	NA
Š	9.1	Is an LCS recovery form present?	X		
Č	9.2	Is an LCS analyzed at the required frequency of one per twenty field samples for each matrix?	X		
Ç	9.3	Are all LCS %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP?	X		
ç	9.4	If Level IV, verify the % recoveries are calculated correctly.			X
		Action for specific compound outside the acceptance criteria: %R>UCL,			
		J(+) only; $<$ LCL, $J(+)/UJ(-)$; $<$ 30% $J(+)/R(-)$. RPD failures should be flagged "J" $(+$ only)			

Note: All LCS recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

10.0 Internal Standards (Code I)

					Yes	No	NA
10.1	Are internal standard areas for every sample and blank within upper and lower QC limits?						
	Area > +100% Area < -50% Area < -10%					•	•
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			
Note:				pecifications are met for a give e not to flag individual samples			
10.2	Are retention tin	nes of internal standards wit	hin 30 seconds of the associ	ated calibration standard?	X		
	Action: The chromatogram must be examined to determine if any false positives or negatives exist. F					•	•
	shift of a large magnitude, the reviewer may consider partial or total rejection of the data for non-detects						
	that sample/fract	tion.					

Note: Internal standard area counts and retention times were within evaluation criteria.

11.0 TCL I	Yes	No	NA	
11.1	Is the relative retention time (RRT) of each reported compound within 0.06 RRT units of the standard			
	RRT in the continuing calibration?			X
11.2	Are the three ions of greatest intensity present in the standard mass spectrum also present in the sample			
	mass spectrum; and do sample and standard relative ion intensities agree within 30%?			X

Note:

12.0 TCL/T	Yes	No	NA			
12.1	12.1 Are RLs used consistent with those specified in the QAPP					
12.2	12.2 Are these limits adjusted to reflect dilutions and/ or percent solids as required?					
12.3	Are TIC ions greater than ten percent in the reference spectrum also present in the sample spectrum?			X		
12.4	Are any positives reported that exceed the linear range of the instrument? If yes, than flag "J".			X		
12.5	If Level IV, calculate a sample of positive results to verify correct calculation			X		
Note:						

I:\CHEM\Sauget_Solutia\Level III\SDG SAS052.xls 4of5 9/4/2008

13.0 Field Duplicate Samples (Code F)			No	NA
13.1	Were any field duplicates submitted for VOC analysis		X	
13.2	Were all RPD or absolute difference values within the control limits outlined in the QAPP?			X
	Action: No qualifying action is taken based on field duplicate results, however the data validator shou			
	provide a qualitative assessment in the data validation report.			
Note:	Field duplicate samples were not submitted for analysis.			

14.0 Data Completeness

			Yes	No	NA
14.1	14.1 Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check QAPP or use 95% for aqueous sample				
14.2	Number of samples: 4				
14.3	Number of target compounds in each analysis 60				
14.4	4 Number of results rejected and not reported 0 % Completeness = 100 x ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)				
	% Completeness	100			

Reviewer:	Steve Gragert		Project Name: S	Sauget - Area 2 Air Sampling
Date:	11/14/2007		Project Number:	21561683.80012
Laboratory	Air Toxics		SDG No.:	0709528
_			Review Level:	Level III
Major Anomo	olies:			
	No samples were rejected			
-				
=				
Minor Anomo	olies:			
:	Samples were qualified "J/UJ" due to	low LCS recovery.		
-				
Field IDs:	VI-3-B	VI-4-D		

VI-3-B	VI-4-D
VI-3-C	VI-4-E
VI-4-C	VI-4-C DUP

1.0 Chain of Custody/Sample Condition

		res	NO	NA
1.1	Do Chain-of-Custody forms list all samples analyzed?	X		
1.2	Are all Chain-of-Custody forms signed, indicating sample chain-of-custody was maintained?	X		
1.3	Do the Traffic Reports, chain-of-custody, and lab narrative indicate any problems with sample receipt,			
	condition of samples, analytical problems or special circumstances affecting the quality of the data?		X	

Note: No issues were noted in the laboratory case narrative or cooler receipt forms.

2.0 Holding Time/ Preservation (Code H)

		Yes	No	NA
2.1	Do sample preservation, collection and storage condition meet method requirement?	X		
	If sample preservation and/or temperature was inappropriate (i.e., $<2^{\circ}>6^{\circ}$ C, etc.), comment in report. It unpreserved or temperature is outside the range 0° (but not frozen) to 10° flag all positive results with a "J" and all non-detects "UJ". If temperature exceeds 10° , flag positive detections "J" and non-detects "R			
2.2	Have any technical holding times, determined from sampling to date of analysis, been exceeded? If yes, $J(+)/UJ(-)$.			
	Matrix Preserved Holding Time			
	Air No 14 days			
2.3	Have any technical holding times been grossly (twice the holding time) exceeded? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$.		X	

Note: All holding time criteria were met.

		Yes	No	NA
3.1	Are GC/MS Tuning and Mass Calibration forms present for bromofluorobenzene (BFB)?			X
3.2	3.2 Have all samples been analyzed within twelve hours of the BFB tune? If no, flag R.			
3.3	Have ion abundance criteria for BFB been met for each instrument used? If no, flag R.			X

Note:

4.0 Blanks (Method Blanks, Field Blanks and Trip Blanks)

(Code X - Field Blank Contamination, Code Y - Trip blank contamination, Code Z - Method blank contamination

		Yes	No	NA
4.1	Is a Method Blank Summary form present for each batch?	X		
4.2	Do any method blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
4.3	Do any field/trip rinse/equipment blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?			X
	Action: Positive sample results <5X (or 10X for common volatile lab contaminants- methylene chloride, acetone, and 2-butanone) the blank concentration should be qualified "U". The result should be elevated the RL for estimate (laboratory "J" flagged) concentrations.			
4.4	If Level IV, review raw data and verify all detections for blanks were reported.			X

Note: All blank criteria were met.

5.0 GC/MS Initial Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
5.1	Are Initial Calibration summary forms present and complete for each instrument used?			X
5.2	Are CCCs linear applying either %RSD < 30% and all other compounds <15% or >0.990?			X
	If not, J(+)/ UJ(-). In extreme cases, the reviewer may flag non-detects "R".			
5.3	Do any SPCC compounds have an RRF less than specification or any other compounds < 0.05 (use 0.01			
	for poor responders like ketones or alcohols)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$.			X
5.4	Is the lowest standard at the same concentration, or lower, as the RL reported? If not, elevate RL.			X
5.5	If Level IV, recalculate a sample of RRFs and %RSDs to verify correct calculations are being made.			X

Note:

6.0 Continuing Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
6.1	Are Continuing Calibration Summary forms present and complete?			X
6.2	Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours?			X
6.3	Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4.			X
6.4	Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial ar continuing calibration RRF outside QC limits (%D < 20%)?			X
	If yes, a marginal increase in response >20% then $J(+)$ only; a decrease in response then $J(+)/UJ(-)$. For %D > 50%, flag R.			
6.5	Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$.	·		X
6.6	If Level IV, calculate a sample of RFs and %Ds from ave RF to verify correct calculations.			X

7.0 Surrogate Recovery (Code S)

						Yes	No	NA
7.1	Are all sampl	es listed on the	appropriate Surrogate Recovery Su	ımmary Form ?		X		
7.2	Are surrogate recoveries within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP for all samples?				X			
7.3	If No in Section 7.2, were these sample(s) or method blank(s) reanalyzed?							X
7.4	If No in Section 7.3, is any sample dilution factor greater than 10? (Surrogate recoveries may be diluted							
	out.)						X	
	Note: If SMO	C recoveries do	not meet acceptance criteria in sam	ples chosen for the MS/MSD	or diluted			
		> UCL	10% to LCL	< 10%				
	Positive	J	J	J				
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R				

Note: All surrogate recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

8.0 Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) or one MS with a Sample Duplicate (Recovery - Code M, RPD - Code D)

		Yes	No	NA
8.1	Is a Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate recovery form present?		X	
8.2	Are MS/MSDs analyzed at the required frequency of one matrix spike per ten samples and a duplicate per	•		
6.2	twenty for each matrix?			X
8.3	Are all MS/MSD %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria Specified in the QAPP?			X
	Using informed professional judgment, the data reviewer should use the MS and MSD results in			
conjunction with other QC criteria and determine the need for qualification of the data for samples compared to the data for samples				
	the same site/matrix. Recoveries <10% may require rejection. RPD failures may be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: MS/MSD samples were not submitted for analysis.

9.0 Laboratory Control Sample (LCS/LCSD) (Recovery - Code L, RPD - Code E)

		Yes	No	NA
9.1	Is an LCS recovery form present?	X		
9.2	Is an LCS analyzed at the required frequency of one per twenty field samples for each matrix?	X		
9.3	Are all LCS %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP?		X	
9.4	If Level IV, verify the % recoveries are calculated correctly.			X
Action for specific compound outside the acceptance criteria: %R>UCL,				
	J(+) only; $<$ LCL, $J(+)/UJ(-)$; $<$ 30% $J(+)/R(-)$. RPD failures should be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: Dichlorodifluoromethane (Freon 12) had a LCS recovery (62%) outside of evaluation criteria (70-130%). Analytes that required qualification due to LCS recoveries are located in the table below:

Field ID	Analyte(s)	Qualification	Code	Batch #	Justification
VI-3-B	Freon 12	J	L	t1410921b	Low LCS recovery
VI-3-C	Freon 12	UJ	L	t14l0921b	Low LCS recovery
VI-4-C	Freon 12	J	L	t14l0921b	Low LCS recovery
VI-4-C DUP	Freon 12	J	L	t14l0921b	Low LCS recovery
VI-4-D	Freon 12	UJ	L	t14l0921b	Low LCS recovery
VI-4-E	Freon 12	UJ	L	t14l0921b	Low LCS recovery

10.0 Internal Standards (Code I)

					Yes	No	NA
10.1	Are internal standard areas for every sample and blank within upper and lower QC limits?			X			
		Area>+100%	Area < -50%	Area < -10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			
Note:	· ·	1		pecifications are met for a give e not to flag individual samples			
10.2			hin 30 seconds of the associ		X		
	shift of a large m	Action: The chromatogram must be examined to determine if any false positives or negatives exist. F shift of a large magnitude, the reviewer may consider partial or total rejection of the data for non-detects in that sample/fraction.					

Note: Internal standard area counts and retention times were within evaluation criteria.

11.0 TCL I	11.0 TCL Identification (Code W)			NA
11.1	Is the relative retention time (RRT) of each reported compound within 0.06 RRT units of the standard			
	RRT in the continuing calibration?			X
11.2	Are the three ions of greatest intensity present in the standard mass spectrum also present in the sample			
	mass spectrum; and do sample and standard relative ion intensities agree within 30%?			X
Note:				

12.0 TCL/TIC Quantitation and Reported Detection limits (Code K) Yes NA Are RLs used consistent with those specified in the QAPP X 12.2 Are these limits adjusted to reflect dilutions and/ or percent solids as required? X Are TIC ions greater than ten percent in the reference spectrum also present in the sample spectrum? 12.3 X Are any positives reported that exceed the linear range of the instrument? If yes, than flag "J". 12.4 X If Level IV, calculate a sample of positive results to verify correct calculation 12.5 X

Note:

13.0 Field D	uplicate Samples (Code F)	Yes	No	NA
13.1	13.1 Were any field duplicates submitted for VOC analysis			
13.2	Were all RPD or absolute difference values within the control limits outlined in the QAPP?	X		
	Action: No qualifying action is taken based on field duplicate results, however the data validator shou			
	provide a qualitative assessment in the data validation report.			

Note: Sample VI-4-C-DUP was the field duplicate for sample VI-4-C.

14.0 Data Completeness

			Y es	No	NA
14.1	Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check Q.	APP or use 95% for aqueous sample	X		
14.2	Number of samples:	6			
14.3	Number of target compounds in each analysis	60			
14.4	Number of results rejected and not reported	0			
	% Completeness = $100 \text{ x} ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)$				
	% Completeness	100			

Reviewer:	Steve Gragert	Project Name: S	Sauget - Area 2 Air Sampling
Date:	11/13/2007	Project Number:	21561683.80012
Laboratory S	evern Trent Laboratory - Savannah	SDG No.:	0709494
		Review Level:	Level III
Major Anomol	ies:		
<u>N</u>	o samples were rejected		
Minor Anomol	ies: amples were qualified "J/UJ" due to low LCS recovery.		
Field IDs:	VI-4-A VI-4-B VI-092107-FB VI-3-A		

1.0 Chain of Custody/Sample Condition

		Y es	No	NA
1.1	Do Chain-of-Custody forms list all samples analyzed?	X		
1.2	Are all Chain-of-Custody forms signed, indicating sample chain-of-custody was maintained?		X	
1.3	Do the Traffic Reports, chain-of-custody, and lab narrative indicate any problems with sample receipt,			
	condition of samples, analytical problems or special circumstances affecting the quality of the data?		X	

Note:

The laboratory case narrative indicated the COC was not signed by the field sampler. Chain of custody was not relinquished properly. URS was notified of the discrepancy. The laboratory indicated the cooler arrived with custody seals intact and all samples were recived in good condition. No qualification of data was required. No other issues were noted in the laboratory case narrative or cooler receipt forms.

2.0 Holding Time/ Preservation (Code H)

					Yes	No	NA
2.1	2.1 Do sample preservation, collection and storage condition meet method requirement? If sample preservation and/or temperature was inappropriate (i.e., <2° >6°C, etc.), comment in report. If unpreserved or temperature is outside the range 0° (but not frozen) to 10° flag all positive results with a "J" and all non-detects "UJ". If temperature exceeds 10°, flag positive detections "J" and non-detects "R".				X		
2.2	Have any technic J(+)/UJ(-).	al holding times, determine	ned from sampling to date of ana	lysis, been exceeded? If yes,		X	
	Matrix Air	Preserved No	Holding Time 14 days				
2.3					X		

Note: All holding time criteria were met.

		Yes	No	NA
3.1	Are GC/MS Tuning and Mass Calibration forms present for bromofluorobenzene (BFB)?			X
3.2	Have all samples been analyzed within twelve hours of the BFB tune? If no, flag R.			X
3.3	Have ion abundance criteria for BFB been met for each instrument used? If no, flag R.			X

Note:

Note:

4.0 Blanks (Method Blanks, Field Blanks and Trip Blanks)

(Code X - Field Blank Contamination, Code Y - Trip blank contamination, Code Z - Method blank contamination

		Yes	No	NA
4.1 Is a Method Blank Summary form present for each batch?		X		
4.2	Do any method blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
4.3	Do any field/trip rinse/equipment blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)?		X	
	Action: Positive sample results <5X (or 10X for common volatile lab contaminants- methylene chloride,			
	acetone, and 2-butanone) the blank concentration should be qualified "U". The result should be elevated			
	the RL for estimate (laboratory "J" flagged) concentrations.			
4.4	If Level IV, review raw data and verify all detections for blanks were reported.			X

Field Blank VI-092107-FB had a detection of Oxygen (20%). Professional judgment was used to not qualify Oxygen due to the fact it is naturally occurring in the air.

5.0 GC/MS Initial Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
5.1	Are Initial Calibration summary forms present and complete for each instrument used?			X
5.2	Are CCCs linear applying either %RSD < 30% and all other compounds <15% or >0.990?			X
	If not, J(+)/ UJ(-). In extreme cases, the reviewer may flag non-detects "R".			
5.3	Do any SPCC compounds have an RRF less than specification or any other compounds < 0.05 (use 0.01			
	for poor responders like ketones or alcohols)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$.			X
5.4	Is the lowest standard at the same concentration, or lower, as the RL reported? If not, elevate RL.			X
5.5	If Level IV, recalculate a sample of RRFs and %RSDs to verify correct calculations are being made.			X

Note:

6.0 Continuing Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
6.1	Are Continuing Calibration Summary forms present and complete?			X
6.2	Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours?			X
6.3	Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4.			X
6.4	Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial ar			
	continuing calibration RRF outside QC limits (%D < 20%)?			X
	If yes, a marginal increase in response $>20\%$ then $J(+)$ only; a decrease in response then $J(+)/UJ(-)$. For		•	
	%D > 50%, flag R.			
6.5	Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$.			X
6.6	If Level IV, calculate a sample of RFs and %Ds from ave RF to verify correct calculations.			X

7.0 Surrogate Recovery (Code S)

					Yes	No	NA
7.1	Are all sampl	es listed on the a	ppropriate Surrogate Recovery Su	ımmary Form ?	X		
7.2	Are surrogate	recoveries withi	in acceptance criteria specified in	the QAPP for all samples?	X		
7.3	If No in Secti	on 7.2, were the	se sample(s) or method blank(s) re	eanalyzed?			X
7.4	If No in Secti	on 7.3, is any sar	mple dilution factor greater than 1	0? (Surrogate recoveries may	be diluted		
	out.)						X
	Note: If SMO	IC recoveries do not meet acceptance criteria in samples chosen for the MS/MSD or diluted		or diluted			
		> UCL	10% to LCL	< 10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			

Note: All surrogate recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

8.0 Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) or one MS with a Sample Duplicate (Recovery - Code M, RPD - Code D)

		Yes	No	NA
8.1	Is a Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate recovery form present?		X	
8.2	Are MS/MSDs analyzed at the required frequency of one matrix spike per ten samples and a duplicate per	•		
6.2	twenty for each matrix?			X
8.3	Are all MS/MSD %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria Specified in the QAPP?			X
	Using informed professional judgment, the data reviewer should use the MS and MSD results in			
	conjunction with other QC criteria and determine the need for qualification of the data for samples om			
	the same site/matrix. Recoveries <10% may require rejection. RPD failures may be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: MS/MSD samples were not submitted for analysis.

9.0 Laboratory Control Sample (LCS/LCSD) (Recovery - Code L, RPD - Code E)

		Yes	No	NA
9.1	Is an LCS recovery form present?	X		
9.2	Is an LCS analyzed at the required frequency of one per twenty field samples for each matrix?	X		
9.3	Are all LCS %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP?		X	
9.4	If Level IV, verify the % recoveries are calculated correctly.			X
	Action for specific compound outside the acceptance criteria: %R>UCL,			
	J(+) only; $<$ LCL, $J(+)/UJ(-)$; $<$ 30% $J(+)/R(-)$. RPD failures should be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: Dichlorodifluoromethane (Freon 12) had a LCS recovery (62%) outside of evaluation criteria (70-130%). Analytes that required qualification due to LCS recoveries are located in the table below:

Field ID	Analyte(s)	Qualification	Code	Batch #	Justification
VI-4-A	Freon 12	UJ	L	t14l0921b	Low LCS recovery
VI-4-B	Freon 12	UJ	L	t1410921b	Low LCS recovery
VI-3-A	Freon 12	J	L	t14l0921b	Low LCS recovery

10.0 Internal Standards (Code I)

					Yes	No	NA
10.1	Are internal stand	dard areas for every sample	and blank within upper and	lower QC limits?	X		
		Area>+100%	Area < -50%	Area < -10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			
Note:	· ·	1		pecifications are met for a give e not to flag individual samples			
10.2			hin 30 seconds of the associ		X		
		agnitude, the reviewer may	•	positives or negatives exist. Fection of the data for non-detec			

Note: Internal standard area counts and retention times were within evaluation criteria.

11.0 TCL Identification (Code W)			Yes	No	NA
1	11.1	Is the relative retention time (RRT) of each reported compound within 0.06 RRT units of the standard			
		RRT in the continuing calibration?			X
1	11.2	Are the three ions of greatest intensity present in the standard mass spectrum also present in the sample			
		mass spectrum; and do sample and standard relative ion intensities agree within 30%?			X

Note:

12.0 TCL/TIC Quantitation and Reported Detection limits (Code K)				NA
12.1	Are RLs used consistent with those specified in the QAPP			X
12.2	Are these limits adjusted to reflect dilutions and/ or percent solids as required?			X
12.3	Are TIC ions greater than ten percent in the reference spectrum also present in the sample spectrum?			X
12.4	Are any positives reported that exceed the linear range of the instrument? If yes, than flag "J".			X
12.5	If Level IV, calculate a sample of positive results to verify correct calculation			X

Note:

_1	3.0 Field D	ruplicate Samples (Code F)	Yes	No	NA
I	13.1	Were any field duplicates submitted for VOC analysis		X	
	13.2	Were all RPD or absolute difference values within the control limits outlined in the QAPP?			X
		Action: No qualifying action is taken based on field duplicate results, however the data validator shou			
		provide a qualitative assessment in the data validation report.			

Note: Field duplicate samples were not submitted for analysis.

14.0 Data Completeness

			Yes	No	NA
14.1	Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check Q	APP or use 95% for aqueous sample	X		
14.2	Number of samples:	4	·		•
14.3	Number of target compounds in each analysis	60	ì		
14.4	Number of results rejected and not reported	0	ì		
	% Completeness = $100 \times ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)$		ì		
	% Completeness	100	<u> </u>		
Note:					

I:\CHEM\Sauget_Solutia\Level III\SDG SAS052.xls 4of4

 Reviewer:
 Steve Gragert

 Date:
 11/13/2007

 Laboratory
 Air Toxics

Project Name: Sauget - Area 2 Air Sampling
Project Number: 21561683.80012

SDG No.: 0709432

Review Level: Level III

Major Anomolies:

No samples were rejected

Minor Anomolies:

Samples were qualified 'U" due to field blank contaminaton.

Field IDs:

VI-2-B
VI-091907-FB
VI-2-D

1.0 Chain of Custody/Sample Condition

		Yes	No	NA
1.1	Do Chain-of-Custody forms list all samples analyzed	X		
1.2	Are all Chain-of-Custody forms signed, indicating sample chain-of-custody was maintained	X		
1.3	Do the Traffic Reports, chain-of-custody, and lab narrative indicate any problems with sample receipt	,		
	condition of samples, analytical problems or special circumstances affecting the quality of the data?		X	
 Note:	No issues were noted in the laboratory case narrative or cooler receipt forms.			

2.0 Holding Time/ Preservation (Code H)

		Yes	No	NA
2.1	Do sample preservation, collection and storage condition meet method requirement	X		
	If sample preservation and/or temperature was inappropriate (i.e., <2° >6°C, etc.), comment in report.			
	If unpreserved or temperature is outside the range 0° (but not frozen) to 10° flag all positive results			
	with a "J" and all non-detects "UJ". If temperature exceeds 10°, flag positive detections "J" and non-			
2.2	Have any technical holding times, determined from sampling to date of analysis, been exceeded?			
	yes, J(+)/UJ(-).		X	
	Matrix Preserved Holding Time			
	Air No 14 days			
2.3	Have any technical holding times been grossly (twice the holding time) exceeded? If yes, J(+)/R(X	
Note:	All holding time criteria were met.			·

		Yes	No	NA
3.1	Are GC/MS Tuning and Mass Calibration forms present for bromofluorobenzene (BFB)			X
3.2	Have all samples been analyzed within twelve hours of the BFB tune? If no, flag F			X
3.3	Have ion abundance criteria for BFB been met for each instrument used? If no, flag F			X

Note:

4.0 Blanks (Method Blanks, Field Blanks and Trip Blanks)

(Code X - Field Blank Contamination, Code Y - Trip blank contamination, Code Z - Method blank contamination)

		Yes	No	NA
4.1	Is a Method Blank Summary form present for each batch	X		
4.2	Do any method blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)		X	
4.3	Do any field/trip rinse/equipment blanks have positive VOA results (TCL and/or TIC)	X		
	Action: Positive sample results <5X (or 10X for common volatile lab contaminants- methylene		•	
	chloride, acetone, and 2-butanone) the blank concentration should be qualified "U". The result should	l		
	be elevated to the RL for estimate (laboratory "J" flagged) concentrations.			
4.4	If Level IV, review raw data and verify all detections for blanks were reported			X

Note:

Field Blank VI-091907-FB had detections of the following analytes (in µg/m³): Chloromethane (0.32), Ethanol (2.8), Acetone (13), 2-Butanone (9.8), Benzene (0.51), Toluene (2.8), m,p-Xylene (2.4), 4-Ethyltoluene (0.85), 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene (0.90), and Oxygen (20%). Professional judgment was used to not qualify Oxygen due to the fact it is naturally occurring in the air. Analytes that required qualification due to Field Blank detections are located in the table below:

Field ID	Analyte(s)	Qualification	Code	Batch #	Justification
VI-2-D	4-Ethyltoluene	U	X	y092515.d	Field Blank contamination
VI-2-B	2-Butanone	U	X	y092515.d	Field Blank contamination
VI-2-B	Benzene	U	X	y092515.d	Field Blank contamination

5.0 GC/MS Initial Calibration (Code C)

	Yes	No	NA
5.1 Are Initial Calibration summary forms present and complete for each instrument used			X
5.2 Are CCCs linear applying either %RSD < 30% and all other compounds <15% or >0.9905			X
If not, J(+)/ UJ(-). In extreme cases, the reviewer may flag non-detects "R			
5.3 Do any SPCC compounds have an RRF less than specification or any other compounds < 0.05 (use			X
5.4 Is the lowest standard at the same concentration, or lower, as the RL reported? If not, elevate RI			X
5.5 If Level IV, recalculate a sample of RRFs and %RSDs to verify correct calculations are being mad			X

6.0 Continuing Calibration (Code C)

		Yes	No	NA
6.1	Are Continuing Calibration Summary forms present and complete			X
6.2	Has a continuing calibration standard been analyzed every 12 hours			X
6.3	Have all SPCCs and CCCs met method specifications? If not, comment in report, proceed to 6.4			X
6.4	Do any compounds have a % difference (or % drift for quantitation from a curve) (%D) between initial			X
	If yes, a marginal increase in response $>20\%$ then J(+) only; a decrease in response then J(+)/UJ(-).			
6.5	Do any compounds have an RRF < 0.05 (use 0.01 for poor responders)? If yes, $J(+)/R(-)$			X
6.6	If Level IV, calculate a sample of RFs and %Ds from ave RF to verify correct calculation			X

Note:

7.0 Surrogate Recovery (Code S)

					Yes	No	NA
7.1	Are all sample	les listed on the a	appropriate Surrogate Recovery S	ummary Form ?	X		
7.2	Are surrogate	e recoveries with	in acceptance criteria specified in	the QAPP for all samples?			
					X		
7.3	If No in Sect	If No in Section 7.2, were these sample(s) or method blank(s) reanalyzed?					X
7.4	If No in Sect	ion 7.3, is any sa	mple dilution factor greater than	10? (Surrogate recoveries may be			X
	Note: If SMC recoveries do not meet acceptance criteria in samples chosen for the MS/MSD or						
		> UCL	10% to LCL	< 10%			
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			

Note: All surrogate recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

8.0 Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate (MS/MSD) or one MS with a Sample Duplicate (Recovery - Code M, RPD - Code D)

		Yes	No	NA
8.1	Is a Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicate recovery form present		X	
8.2	Are MS/MSDs analyzed at the required frequency of one matrix spike per ten samples and a duplicate per twenty for each matrix?			X
8.3	Are all MS/MSD %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria Specified in the QAPP? Using informed professional judgment, the data reviewer should use the MS and MSD results in conjunction with other QC criteria and determine the need for qualification of the data for samples			X
	from the same site/matrix. Recoveries <10% may require rejection. RPD failures may be flagged "J"			

Note: MS/MSD samples were not submitted for analysis.

9.0 Laboratory Control Sample (LCS/LCSD) (Recovery - Code L, RPD - Code E)

			Yes	No	NA
	9.1	Is an LCS recovery form present?			
	9.2	Is an LCS analyzed at the required frequency of one per twenty field samples for each matrix?	X		
	9.3	Are all LCS %Rs and RPDs within acceptance criteria specified in the QAPP?	X		
	9.4	If Level IV, verify the % recoveries are calculated correctly.			X
		Action for specific compound outside the acceptance criteria: %R>UCL,			
J(+) only; $<$ LCL, $J(+)/UJ(-)$; $<$ 30% $J(+)/R(-)$.		J(+) only; $<$ LCL, $J(+)/UJ(-)$; $<$ 30% $J(+)/R(-)$. RPD failures should be flagged "J" (+ only)			

Note: All LCS recoveries were within evaluation criteria.

10.0 Internal Standards (Code I)

					Yes	No	NA
10.1	10.1 Are internal standard areas for every sample and blank within upper and lower QC limits?						
	Are internal standard areas for every sample and blank within upper and lower QC limits? Area > +100% Area < -50% Area < -10% Positive J J J						
	Positive	J	J	J			
	Non-detect	None	UJ	R			
Note:			ng calibration to be compare tion. Thus, if all other QC s	1			
	given sample, usir	ng informed professional ju	adgment, the reviewer may	choose not to flag individual			
10.2	Are retention time	es of internal standards with	hin 30 seconds of the associ	ated calibration standard?	X		
	Are retention times of internal standards within 30 seconds of the associated calibration standard? Action: The chromatogram must be examined to determine if any false positives or negatives exist. For shift of a large magnitude, the reviewer may consider partial or total rejection of the data for non detects in that sample/fraction.						

Note: Internal standard area counts and retention times were within evaluation criteria.

11.0 TCL Ident	tification (Code W)	Yes	No	NA
11.1	Is the relative retention time (RRT) of each reported compound within 0.06 RRT units of the standard			X
11.2	Are the three ions of greatest intensity present in the standard mass spectrum also present in the			X

Note:

12.0 TCL/TIC Quantitation and Reported Detection limits (Code K)		Yes	No	NA
12.1	Are RLs used consistent with those specified in the QAPP			X
12.2	Are these limits adjusted to reflect dilutions and/ or percent solids as required			X
12.3	Are TIC ions greater than ten percent in the reference spectrum also present in the sample spectrum			X
12.4	Are any positives reported that exceed the linear range of the instrument? If yes, than flag "J			X
12.5	If Level IV, calculate a sample of positive results to verify correct calculations			X

13.0 Field Duplicate Samples (Code F)		Yes	No	NA
13.1	Were any field duplicates submitted for VOC analysis?		X	
13.2	Were all RPD or absolute difference values within the control limits outlined in the QAPP'			X
	Action: No qualifying action is taken based on field duplicate results, however the data validato			
	should provide a qualitative assessment in the data validation report.			
Note:	Field doublests complex more not coloniated for english			

Note: Field duplicate samples were not submitted for analysis.

14.0 Data Completeness

		Yes	No	NA
14.1	Is % completeness within the control limits? (Control limit: Check QAPP or use 95% for aqueous	X		
14.2	Number of samples: 3			
14.3	Number of target compounds in each analysis 60			
14.4	Number of results rejected and not reported:			
	% Completeness = $100 \times ((14.1 * 14.2) - 14.3) / (14.1 * 14.2)$			
	% Completeness 100			